DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 084 185 SO 006 469

AUTHOR Todd, Frederick W.
TITLE Social Policy Planning Programs and Prospects.
INSTITUTION National Inst. of Mental Health (DHEW), Rockville, Md. Center for Studies of Metropolitan Problems.
PUB DATE 1 Sep 72
NOTE 234p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$9.87
DESCRIPTORS *City Planning; Comparative Analysis; Educational Objectives; Educational Planning; *Educational Policy; Graduate Study; Higher Education; *Policy Formation; Program Descriptions; Program Evaluation; Regional Planning; *Social Planning; *Social Problems; Social Systems

ABSTRACT

This study, a monitor of four experimental training programs in the field of social policy planning, has as its purpose to assess program development and outcomes and to relate any significant findings useful in educational program development for social policy professionals. The programs are discussed at two levels: individually in terms of their own objectives, curriculum, faculty, performance, and self-evaluation; and collectively in the larger context of university education and the city planning professions. The four programs are located at universities in Puerto Rico, Florida, North Carolina, and California. Two types of training programs, instrumental and clinical, are differentiated, and the associated strengths and weaknesses of each general type are analyzed. The assessment observes that the programs have not constituted major advances in graduate planning education, nor fully met their own objectives. It is argued that the programs reflect a consistent pattern of thinking regarding the nature of social structure and social problems that carries with it an implicit orientation to the status quo. The appendices list illustrative course listings and program sequences. References are included. (Author/KSM)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 084185

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SOCIAL POLICY PLANNING PROGRAMS AND PROSPECTS

SP 006 469

National Institute of Mental Health

ED 084185

SOCIAL POLICY PLANNING PROGRAMS AND PROSPECTS

Prepared for

The Center for the Study of Metropolitan Problems
of the National Institute of Mental Health

by

Frederick W. Todd

September 1, 1972

FOREWORD

This report, "Social Policy Planning Programs and Prospects," is an initial attempt by the Center for Studies of Metropolitan Problems of the National Institute of Mental Health to assess the development and tentative outcomes of four social policy training programs which it has supported. The purpose of this report is to inform ourselves, and program administrators, faculty members, students, and other interested persons about significant findings to date which may be useful in the development and improvement of educational programs for social policy professionals.

"Social Policy Planning Programs and Prospects" was prepared by Mr. Frederick W. Todd, a graduate student in the Department of Urban Affairs, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, under a contract with the Center for Studies of Metropolitan Problems. Mr. Todd was assisted by Mr. Maury Lieberman, Urban Planner, who served as project officer representing the Center.

The Center welcomes any reactions and responses to this document.

Elliot Liebow, Ph.D., Chief
Center for Studies of Metropolitan Problems
Division of Special Mental Health Programs
National Institute of Mental Health

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	SUMMARY	1
II.	PROGRAM DESCRIPTION	5
	A. Introduction	
	B. Objectives	
	C. Program Design: Curriculum, Faculty, and Students	
	1. Curriculum	
	2. Faculty	
	3. Students	
	4. Self-Evaluation	
	D. Program Performance	
	1. Florida State	
	2. Puerto Rico	
	3. North Carolina	
	4. Berkeley	
	E. Evaluation	
III.	SOCIAL POLICY PLANNING IN CONTEXT	115
	A. Introduction	
	B. City Planning and the Development of Social Policy Planning	
	C. Social Policy Planning in the University Setting	
	D. Losing Touch with Reality: Social Policy Planning and the Status Quo	
IV.	APPENDIX	157
V.	REFERENCES	219

LIST OF TABLES

I. Program Data

II. Core Requirements by Program

III. Course Offerings by Social Planning Program

IV. Fieldwork by Program

V. Social Policy Planning Faculty: Florida State

VI. Social Policy Planning Faculty: Puerto Rico

VII. Social Planning Faculty: North Carolina

VIII. Social Policy Planning Faculty: Berkeley

IX. Social Policy Planning Faculty: M. I. T.

X. Social Policy Planning Faculty: All Programs

XI. Social Planning Graduate Job Placements, by Program

XII. Placements, by Location, Agency, and Program

I. SUMMARY

This study attempts to monitor four NIMH supported experimental training programs in the field of social policy planning at the following universities: University of Puerto Rico, Florida State University, University of North Carolina, and the University of California at Berkeley. Four additional programs are discussed briefly for purposes of comparison. The intent is to provide feedback for the purpose of improving program performance.

Programs are discussed at two levels: individually in terms of their own objectives, curriculum, faculty, performance, and self-evaluation (Part I); and collectively in the larger context of university education, and development and change in the city planning profession (Part II).

Since the programs differ in objectives and approaches, comparisons between them is difficult. However, the fact that they tend to share the same successes and failures suggests that the reasons for their failures (and successes) lie not in the programs themselves, but rather in the larger context of the university setting and in the patterns and practices of the city planning profession.

In general, it is argued that these programs have not constituted major advances in graduate planning education, nor have they fully met their own objectives. Program failures tend to cluster in the following areas:

1. They lack methodological content and application.

2. They have not recruited a faculty of sufficient interdisciplinary*

* "Interdisciplinary" is apt to be a troublesome word. In this study, it is used in the sense suggested by Jantsch[1], that is, as a stage or step representing increasing cooperation and coordination in the education/innovation system. (continued on next page)

and/or policy background to lead to the development of effective training in basic skills essential to policy making and analysis.

3. They do not provide adequate fieldwork opportunities or opportunities for practical involvement in policy making.

4. They have not confronted systematically the value questions inherent in social planning, nor have they provided a forum for addressing these issues.

5. They have not been successful in achieving an effective interdisciplinary planning curriculum.

6. They have had little impact on curriculum development or teaching in other university departments or programs.

7. They have not led to the creation of new planning roles for graduates.

For analytical purposes, two types of training programs are differentiated: instrumental and clinical. The instrumental type tends to assume that social policy planning incorporates a set of problems, methods, solutions, etc., that is both teachable (i.e. can be transferred from teacher to student in more or less traditional forms) and applicable to professional practice. Programs in this category tend to emphasize preparation for traditional professional planning roles, and to be relatively self-contained in the use of

---

Interdisciplinary refers to a situation where "a common axiomatics for a group of related disciplines is defined at the next higher hierarchical level, thereby introducing a sense of purpose." It contrasts with multidisciplinary, where "a variety of disciplines are offered simultaneously, but without making explicit possible relationships between them."

Most of the programs included in this sample should properly be considered multidisciplinary (although they are often talked of by participants as interdisciplinary): they encompass a number of different disciplines, but these exist side-by-side and without being drawn together by a transcending conceptual or organizational principle or principles.

the university and the community. The clinical type attempts to explore social policy as a problematical field of inquiry. It stresses individual integration and synthesis of diverse material, innovations in teaching and learning, and holds a pluralistic model of subsequent professional roles.

Each general type has its associated strengths and weaknesses; one function of this paper is to make these explicit.

Taken together, these social policy planning programs seem to have developed in response to external pressures challenging the city planning profession in both theory and practice. Social policy planning represented one segment of the profession competing for sanction to define appropriate planning missions and roles. As a reform effort, it has had limited effect. This study suggests that the traditional city planning concern for comprehensiveness, rationality, the planning process model, and traditional agency roles, has inhibited development of these programs. The return to traditional city planning concerns as evidenced by the current emphasis on "sectoral competence" in the instrumental programs of this sample marks a retreat from both policy analysis and the value orientation implicit in the original social policy planning movement.

Social policy planning programs have thus proven to be a highly restrictive base from which to explore the critical value questions that served as the initial impetus to the development of social planning. It is suggested that one immediate cause of this is the narrow range of field and outside experience afforded the students by the programs along with the narrow composition of both student and faculty bodies.

It is argued that the programs in this study reflect a consistent pattern of thinking regarding the nature of social structure and social problems that carries with it an implicit orientation to the status quo.

If the exploration of alternative roles or approaches to social change are a social policy goal, then these programs are, at present, not likely to provide a goal-supportive environment.

Recommendations are implicit in much of the analysis and evaluation of program performance included in the study.

II. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION: OBJECTIVES, PERFORMANCE, AND EVALUATION

A. Introduction

This section outlines, in comparative fashion, a set of social policy planning programs. While the bulk of the section is descriptive, some estimation is made of the extent to which various programs have achieved their stated objectives. A subsequent section will examine these programs in a larger context and will question whether these stated objectives are appropriate or adequate to the problems addressed.

Eight programs are discussed, but the focus is on the four social planning training programs funded by the Center for the Study of Metropolitan Problems (NIMH). All four programs are based in departments of city and regional planning, although they vary in size, objectives, and approach. This group of four includes the social planning program or option in the Department of Urban and Regional Planning at Florida State University; the Graduate School of Planning at the University of Puerto Rico; the Department of City and Regional Planning at the University of California at Berkeley; and the Department of City and Regional Planning at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Four other programs are included for comparison purposes. These were not subject to detailed study and are intended only to suggest options or alternative approaches to a similar field of interest. One of these programs (the Department of Urban Studies and Planning at M.I.T.) represents what is

generally regarded as an innovative social planning program within a city planning department, but which has developed without NIMH funding. The second is the Florence Heller School at Brandeis which presents social policy from the perspective of the social welfare tradition. The last two programs are in the newly developing field of public policy (policy science, policy planning, etc.): the Graduate School of Public Affairs at the University of California at Berkeley, and the Public Policy Program at the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard.[1] These programs present an approach to similar problems and policy concerns that contrasts with that which developed out of the city planning tradition.

Table I (see page 9) presents summary data on these programs. Information about the programs was drawn from descriptive materials, proposals or applications for funding (in the case of the four NIMH supported programs), and focused interviews conducted with faculty, students, and in a few cases, graduates, of the programs in question. (See Appendix III on Methodology.)

In terms of methodology and practice, several reservations are in order. Within a given program, faculty commitments, evaluations, and objectives can differ widely; so do student perceptions and attitudes towards the program. Where possible, these differences are enumerated; in some instances, it will be necessary to generalize and hopefully this will not involve distortion. A second problem arises from the non-commensurate nature of many important aspects of these programs. As an example, two programs can claim to offer courses in "systems

analysis," yet the material covered or the quality of the student work may vary enormously. Sorting out some of these variations is possible, but the majority exists at a level of detail that cannot be reached in a study of this kind. A third difficulty arises from the nature of proposal writing and the complementary process of approval or disapproval. Goal statements and objectives are presented in such generalized form, often embedded in verbose essays of little substance, that it is difficult to relate them to program performance in any meaningful way. Written to sound impressive, it would appear that they are often read by the funding agency in the same spirit, as chips in a game which can be replayed with higher authorities or other agencies. From the agency point of view, evaluation becomes almost impossible; but more important, valuable opportunities to examine cause and effect relationships within the context of specific projects are lost. Errors can be repeated, and assumptions about inputs and outputs in the training process that would be discredited if subject to rigorous examination persist unquestioned.

In this first section, the training process is the central concern. For the purposes of this study, training can be viewed as a serial process with several critical feedback loops. Students, who bring with them interests, skills, experience, and values, emerge as graduates with the professional Master's level or Ph.D. degree. During the course of study, they have acquired a new set of skills, a conception of appropriate roles based on their training and interests, and a value orientation (assumptions about

politics, change, appropriate conduct, ethical norms, ideologies, etc.). The training process involves faculty as teachers of systematic skills, but involves as well their definitions of appropriate educational objectives, their perceptions of (in this case) social problems and social policy. Research and consulting are additional outputs. In professional training, the kind of feedback that comes from the practicing profession is an important element in determining relevant skills and content, in setting ethical norms, and as one of the primary modes of faculty-administration evaluation of the success of the training process. Nor is the profession alone in shaping the program; it appears that in many of these cases changing student interests and values have had repercussions throughout the program and in graduate education in general.

TABLE I: Program Data

Program	Degree Emphasis	Enrollment[1] S.P.	Enrollment[1] Total	Faculty[2] S.P.	Faculty[2] Total	Graduates[3] To Date	NIMH Funds/Year	Funding Period
Florida State	MCP	16	100	6	23	14	$48,180	7/1/68-6/30/71
Puerto Rico	MCP	16	78	3	19	18	$96,810	1/1/71-6/30/75
U.N.C.	MCP	30	102	4	16	9	$135,585	7/1/67-6/30/72
Berkeley	PhD	18	114	11		1	$144,508	7/1/67-6/30/72
M.I.T.	MCP-16 PhD-13	29	111	5		2	none	
Brandeis	PhD		80		33	97 (since 1959)	none	
Public Affairs (Berkeley)	MPA PhD	30 10	50[4] (projected)		10		none	
Public Policy (Harvard)	MPP	34	51		12	21[5]	none	

NOTES: 1. Enrollment figures for social policy planning are approximate due to variations in departmental procedures regarding specializations and options.
2. Through June, 1970.
3. Faculty size is approximate due to variations in departmental procedures regarding joint appointments, part-time commitments, visiting, etc., but reflect relative orders of social planning specialists to others.
4. First class to be enrolled fall 1971
5. First class graduated spring 1971.

B. Objectives

The objectives of these programs vary: the programs promise a variety of means of reaching them. This section attempts to outline the objectives, as stated, with subsequent sections attempting to evaluate performance towards those goals. It is worth noting at the outset, however, that, as presented in proposals to the NIMH, any notion of the "planning process" (taken to be a statement of objectives, enumeration and analysis of alternative means, and selection of that alternative which clearly links inputs and outputs with the designated goal) is honored more in the breach. One can conclude that either no such planning process underlies the development of these training programs, or the reasoning process was not shared with administrators at NIMH. No doubt this emerges from the desire to present proposals in the best possible light, but one result is that it makes evaluation -- by program participants themselves or by the funding agency -- difficult.

The programs are discussed in terms of stated objectives; the roles the program proposes for its graduates, and the accompanying skills it is felt they will need; the particular notion of social policy planning and social change which underlies the program; and modifications of initial elements or indication of future direction for the program on the basis of present performance.

1. The Florida State social planning specialization was developed "in response to the demonstrated need for professional planners who are sensitive to and trained to manage the delicate relationships in the human environment embracing physical planning and social change." It expects graduates to "bring to the municipal policy-making level

the sensitivity and expertise for planning and programming social change in the area of health, education, mental health, and other social human services."[2]

Social planning, in this program, "is concerned with the quality of the urban condition, and draws its orientation from a broad family of contributing fields, notably psychology, human development, education, social psychiatry, housing, sociology, and social welfare." The focus is on "both the individual and the human groups within which the individual must live."

In the interface between physical planning and social change, the program "conceptualizes urban life as having the properties of a living organism":

> From this conceptual position, we can talk about a city as an organization having intelligence (ability to achieve appropriate selection), learning capacity (capacity for adaptive change), and goal-seeking behavior (strategies in coping with its external environment). It is significant for urban planning that the state of health of the city as an organization (which structures the environment for the health of its citizens) can be understood in terms of the functioning of its information system.... it can be seen that the urban planner who occupies a position of decision-making responsibility in such a system can exert a powerful directing force upon the course of urban development. His actions will be implemented in the mainstream of governmental direction in the city; his actions being taken in response to the field of environmental status information as processed by his own professional judgment and values.[3]

The planner will, in addition, "deal with the urban environment in terms of fundamental human needs."

The proposal states that "national policy-makers have generated an unbelievable number of rough-hewn, challenging measures to be used

as ammunition against our overwhelming social problems," e.g. the war on poverty, civil rights, and voting legislation, focus on community mental health, new developments in housing and urban development. These measures have, in turn, generated "an unprecedented demand for social planners. This demand is spurred by several of the fundamental characteristics of the new measures: an emphasis upon comprehensive services, the involvement of problem-ridden populations in policy making, the need for rapid program development and establishment at local and state levels, the deliberate link being forged between social problem solution and housing and urban development, the vast corps of indigenous sub-professionals, and the evaluation of the impact of the new policies and programs."

The program aims at preparing "programmatic planners with a broad sensitivity; one role they can fill is that of participant conceptualizer," functioning as part of a team orchestrating the actions of other specialists, synthesizing and aiding in problem identification. Relevant skills include "the common body of professional knowledge shared by planners," knowledge about the social welfare system, the behavioral relationships between man and his urban environment, community action and social change, and some knowledge of a specific social field, e.g. housing or health. Specific skills indicated include ability to generate and perform evaluative research, and program planning for a special field, such as housing.

Future directions for the program include building on the core of the present social policy planning program, i.e. on the behavioral basis for planning and change in which "social issues are infused in substantive areas," like housing, health, and aging.

The objectives of the Florida State program might be summarized as follows:

-- to train socially sensitive physical planners.

-- to stress planning in terms of fundamental human needs, as indicated in applied behavioral social science.

-- to propose a new role, "participant conceptualizer," to function within the urban management information system, effecting social change through the provision of information.

2. The Graduate Program in Planning at the University of Puerto Rico offers specialization in four fields: urban planning, concerned with the physical development of cities; economic planning; regional planning, concerned with spatial resource allocation; and social planning, which grows out of a "generalized concern about the shortcomings of urban economic and regional approaches which avoid a direct confrontation with some of the most dangerous social problems at present."

> The social planning program approaches mental health problems from a macro-structural point of view in which mental retardation, alcoholism, delinquency, etc., are seen as manifestations mostly resulting from pressures to migrate, lack of social mobility, deficient social reporting, cultural dependency, etc. Social planning applied to these macro-structural social problems can significantly prevent and reduce such mental health problems....[4]

The program identifies as the most significant problems it must address, cultural dependency, delinquency, insufficent social mobility, and increasing migration to the United States mainland.

Within the context of preparing planners to work in these problem areas, the program has three immediate objectives: to

develop teaching materials, case studies, monographs, textbooks, etc., on selected social problems in the Puerto Rican context; to develop a social reporting system in collaboration with the Puerto Rican Planning Board; and to provide a built-in evaluation component to the social planning program.

The program in turn is expected to influence the Planning Board of Puerto Rico; the teaching of social planning for small, developing economies; and to increase public awareness of social problems and government policies.

Social planning, in the Puerto Rican view, is envisaged "as the utilization and expansion of planning techniques to guide the process of socialization....the process of socialization deals primarily with development of human resources in order to achieve a societal system and organization committed to improvement of welfare, according to explicit criteria and indicators....The process for social planning, as outlined here, represents a means for systematically organizing information for allocating resources across social sectors so as most effectively to influence social processes towards the achievement of social goals.[5]

"The process of socialization deals primarily with the development of human resources and social institutions in order to achieve a societal system and organization committed to improve the distribution of general welfare according to criteria and indicators of education, health, security, participation, mobility, etc. Thus social planning as a teaching endeavor deals with the application of planning techniques to the so-called social subsystem in terms of formulating social policy, programming of social services, and implementation of programs

and projects to deal with social problems concerning citizens and politicians at the community, municipal, regional, or state level."

As defined in the Puerto Rican proposal, these work roles for social planners include four kinds of tasks:

-- collaborative work on social components of physical and economic plans in a variety of government agencies and programs. "The social planner is generally expected to contribute detailed plans dealing with the social, political, cultural, and psychological preconditions and consequences of the plan, and with the effect of these on potential users."

-- sectorial planning for welfare programs, health education, crime and delinquency, poverty programs. "Characteristic of sectorial tasks is the responsibility of the social planner for integrating technical information from professionals to form an overall agency plan."

-- societal planning "includes social policy formulation for planning organizations at central, regional, and municipal levels... characteristic of societal planning is the breadth of its aims and its intervening variables, e.g. major social structures and processes.. specific tasks include calculation of basic projections for the use of other agencies, collection and standardization of comparative statistics, studies of criteria for the allocation of resources between various social programs, analysis of inequality and distribution problems with respect to regions, class, ethnic and age groups."

-- action planning includes "devising implementation strategies considering political and citizen reaction to programs."

Future directions for the program call for reintegration of four specializations into a Chicago-type comprehensive approach to planning education. The program continues to attempt to develop techniques and methods for social planning, and to retain an action orientation which holds sensitivity to people in tension with a macro-structural concern for societal level goals.

Summarized briefly, the program stresses:

-- a basic orientation to social problems as its starting point.

-- an attempt to combine social engineering (planning at a variety of levels) with a societal perspective to "problematicize the existence of people" and subsequently develop social policies which can be resynthesized with solutions.

-- the development of social planning techniques.

-- the training of social planners for a variety of roles within planning agencies, other government departments, and with community or political groups.

3. The University of North Carolina, Department of City and Regional Planning Program in Social Policy Planning, was designed

> ....for the training of social policy planners, whose principal efforts will be aimed at the areas of our nation's cities. Emphasis will be placed upon training persons who are thoroughly familiar with the social and cultural dynamics of the ghetto, who are skilled in dealing with the political aspects of social policy formulation, and who are capable of planning in a comprehensive manner which transcends the rigid professional boundaries which have impeded social problem solving in the past. A variety of field training exercises, featuring direct involvement of students in ghetto communities, will comprise the core of the multi-disciplinary training effort.[6]

The focus of the program is on training practitioners, "training of personnel capable of engaging in effective planning for the elimination of the difficult social problems currently confronting our nation's urban areas." Additionally, a small number of Ph.D. students preparing for careers in teaching and research, are proposed. It was also hoped that the presence of the social policy program in the department would serve to "sensitize all of the Department's students, including those pursuing more traditional lines of planning endeavor, to the social implications of their future work."

The North Carolina program starts with an orientation to social problems--segregation, poor health care, "increasing despair and sense of futility among the poor members of minority groups, resulting in militant reactions to social change operating outside the established political process," urban renewal practice, education, "our failure to create new administrative patterns to coordinate social and economic programs more effectively at the local level," and the lack of "cooperation and coordination" between central cities and suburbs.[7]

> Despite the severity of these and related problems, the cities have not yet developed adequate processes for the formulation and implementation of social policy. While the behavioral sciences have provided us with much of the knowledge and analytical methodology which must underlie such processes, these inputs have not yet been transformed into meaningful programs of public action. Missing are (1) a body of professional planners who are trained to deal with urban social problems in a comprehensive and integrated manner (i.e. from a systems perspective); and (2) administrative structures which would incorporate such a planning process into local patterns of government and political activity.[8]

The model adopted for solution of these problems is the comprehensive planning approach which the application traces from the early welfare councils through the Ford Foundation Grey Areas program, to

the War on Poverty and Model Cities programs. The program proposes implementing the comprehensive approach to urban social problems through the training of social planners, in a multi-disciplinary fashion, with "extensive field experience in ghetto environments," and with the application of "planning concepts and tools directly to the solution of social problems." A city and regional planning department is equipped to move in this direction, it is argued, because "the planning process, as employed by professional planners, is as applicable to social problem-solving as it is to the solving of physical problems; planners have "sensitivity to the impact of the man-made physical environment on patterns of social interaction and pathology, physical and mental health, and related matters; and because of the profession's long-standing concern for the geographical location and distribution of social service facilities."

The program, in training practitioners, stresses knowledge of functional systems related to social policy (sectors like health, housing, etc.) the "various academic disciplines which make substantive contributions to our knowledge of the manner in which the total urban system functions, including urban sociology and ecology, government and politics, and economics, political processes whereby social policy decisions are generally made, the structure and dynamic processes of the ghetto, and the history and culture of the black population; skills, in the planning process, approaching social problems from a systems perspective, bringing "an inter-disciplinary and inter-professional perspective to bear on urban social problems" and communicating effectively with all institutions and actors in the

social policy realm; and attitudes, including a commitment to elimination of poverty and racism as a divisive and debilitating factor."

To impart these skills, the program proposed extensive field experience in ghetto environments, new courses, and in general, an inter-disciplinary approach, involving faculty from other departments (primarily law and public health).

The program anticipated that graduates will be employed by "a variety of organizations, city planning agencies, housing and renewal authorities, health and welfare councils, Model Cities agencies, community action agencies, state and Federal agencies, neighborhood councils, and....in new comprehensive social planning organizations of a type not yet found in our cities."

In summary, the program's goals include:

-- the training of social planners capable of applying planning techniques and tools directly to the solution of social problems.

-- to sensitize a larger number of planners in more traditional planning specializations.

-- to provide extensive background and experience in the ghetto. The proposal stated, "We believe the ghetto to be the primary target for the efforts of the social policy planner."

-- to develop an approach to social problems based on comprehensive, rational planning.

-- to stress practical political sensitivity and "effectiveness" over technical expertise.

4. The Department of City and Regional Planning at the University of California at Berkeley was the first to receive NIMH

support and funding. Unlike the previous three programs outlined above, the Berkeley program concentrates on preparing Ph.D. level graduates to serve as teachers, researchers, or as "professional agents on planned social change."[9] The program objectives combine the preparation of a "new generation of inter-professional professionals" with the need for new theory and analysis, including the "critical evaluation of policy from the standpoint that recognizes the subtle problems of determining value and purpose, the ambiguities in the evaluator's role and the realities of political processes, as well as the need for systematic and carefully collated information."[10]

The Berkeley program is based on the observation that "social policies planning represents an important convergence that has been taking place among a wide array of scientific developments, public programs, and popular movements....conceptual models and empirical findings from once-separated fields have been converging with those of others....it is already apparent that this is no mere eclectic mixture but rather the synthesis of a new field of inquiry and professional practice." Urban problems, the program argued, are primarily "people related and not property related." Effort should now be directed to the "larger task of guiding social change and of accelerating social mobility....(changes which call for) new kinds of professionals, trained to perform new kinds of roles as problem identifiers, planners, evaluators, programmers, investment counsellors, and executors of coherent system-wide packages of services. They also call for a new group of theory builders and empirical researchers who will back up the practitioner. Above all, they call for new ways of looking at

the processes of human and societal development and at the processes by which development processes are guided."[11]

"We believe that we are most likely to alleviate the major problems that are now manifest in our cities, if we apply intelligence to designing multidimensional program bundles that are coherent and mutually reinforcing." Feeling "uneasy about the partisanship and the segmentalism of the professional agencies.... and about the ad hoc character of so many of the new Federal programs....has led to the search for fillers for the large cracks that our several professional fields have left behind.....better ways of instituting those bundles of mutually reinforcing social services that are responsive to social problems, rather than to professional doctrines. Our common search is for better methods of program design, program evaluation, and program budgeting that would promote human development through the planned guidance of social change."

"The social policies planner would be an investment counsellor in the human services....oriented to longer run futures and to wider circles of effects that are typically examined, he would find his place in the inter-agency spaces that are presently unoccupied.... some in budgeting offices, in program-specific agencies....quasi-governmental organizations....universities as teachers of the next generations of social policies planners and as researchers into the functional relations among service programs and the functional effects of those programs."[12]

The training of a generalist with a specialty "demands that each acquire knowledge and capabilities in some aspect of his field of interest and a depth that is commensurate with his intellectual

breadth." Students move through the department Ph.D. sequence (described below) covering planning theory, a specialization in social policy planning, and an optional, but related field of specialization outside the department of city and regional planning. The program expects "the men we will be introducing into the Social Policies Planning field should become the intellectual leaders of the field within a very few years. We expect that it will be our students, quite as much as our faculty, that will be mapping out the future development of this field."

The Berkeley program goals are in brief:

-- the preparation of a new generation of inter-professional professionals and future intellectual leaders (teachers and researchers) of the field;

-- to block out the new field of social policy, exploring its intellectual and academic boundaries.

-- to develop a new inter-disciplinary education, crossing academic boundaries and disciplines, and based on a joint faculty-student effort to define the field.

5. The objectives of the non-Metro Center supported programs may be summarized briefly. The social policy and government institutions specialization option in the M.I.T. Department of Urban Studies and Planning is a concentration "focusing on the design and evaluation of complex urban programs involving both social and environmental action, with emphasis on problems of poverty, race, and citizen participation. Subjects dealt with include the governmental, legal, and institutional setting for policy making; and specialized work in

the fields of health planning, educational planning, income maintenance, and the social components of housing policy." At the Master's level students are expected to understand the relevant urban systems and specialize in a functional area (with general skills in understanding urban society, techniques for analysis, and the synthesis of urban policy), and graduates to work at city agencies, HUD, Federal programs, and with neighborhoods. The Ph.D. level is oriented to teaching and research. The program offers substantive work in housing, and health systems, and is initiating introductory work on social services and education. Recent changes have expanded attention to these functional areas.

The Florence Heller School at Brandeis awards Ph.D. degrees in the field of social welfare and social policy planning. Traditionally, approximately 70 percent of its graduates have remained in academic circles, primarily in social work/welfare education; recently, there is more emphasis on shifting to administrative areas, and to teaching and research in a variety of fields. The program specializations include aging, continuing care, manpower, and health planning; new emphasis is being placed on developing a policy analysis and methodological orientation.

The Graduate School of Public Affairs at the University of California at Berkeley is based on recognition of "the urgency of developing trained analysts to help in the generation, evaluation, and implementation of effective and innovative public policies.... The primary objective of this new program is to promote the intelligent application of systematic analysis to issues of public policy.

The research and teaching program will emphasize both theoretical and applied work and problems of domestic public policy formation....Actual policy problems and the processes associated with defining policy issues, analyzing policy alternative, gaining adoption, implementing new policies and evaluating policy effects will be the central concerns of both the research and teaching programs....when public organizations are studied, it is primarily from the standpoint of their relationship to policy initiative and outcomes." The professional degree in public policy is designed to prepare people to assume roles as producers of analytical studies in public policy, and to take responsibility for policy and administrative roles in which systematic analysis will be applied in policy planning and implementation." The Ph.D. level degree is primarily intended for careers in research and teaching; the program argues that "the practice of policy analysis is not apt to improve unless universities develop both theories and methodologists to deal with the wide range of fundamental questions in the policy areas."

The Public Policy Program at the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard offers "new forms of professional education" for those who intend to make careers marked by elective or appointive public service, broadly defined." The program stresses methodology and "techniques for systematic analysis of problems of policy and administration." It offers Masters, Ph.D., and joint degree options, the latter primarily with law, medicine, and business administration. The program features a diverse faculty, "a strong grounding in the hard (quantitative) tools of analysis and an understanding of how forces in the public sector are moved."

C. Program Design: Curriculum Faculty, and Students

The means to the ends indicated above are embodied in the curricula the various programs propose, the courses, fieldwork and special projects, faculty background, teaching, and research interests, and student background and interests. Progress towards the (stated) objectives depends upon the appropriateness of these elements and their effectiveness.

In viewing these elements (courses, fieldwork, faculty, and students) as they appear in the social policy planning programs in question, it is important to remember that they take place within established departments of city and regional planning, which in their turn are part of the larger university. The social planning programs exist as options within a department that has its own history and organization, relations with other university departments, its own degree and course requirements, and a larger body of faculty and students.

The importance of these considerations is that they serve as boundaries, delineating limits or possibilities that are external, but often critical to the social planning program. The universitites, and hence programs, at Berkeley, Puerto Rico, and M.I.T., for example, are located in large metropolitan centers, offering a tremendous range of field, governmental, and political opportunities for student or faculty involvement; Florida State and North Carolina are located in smaller areas, with less access to big cities, but both in or near state capitals. M.I.T. and Berkeley are old departments; North Carolina dates from 1946; Florida State and Puerto Rico are new departments (1966 and 1965). "National"

universities like Berkeley, and schools with access to a rich environment like M.I.T. in Boston, presumably can offer a range of experience that more regional schools cannot. At this time, the planning departments at Florida State and Puerto Rico do not offer Ph.D. degrees.

1. Curricula. Comparing course work across departments is difficult without resorting to a level of detail impractical in a study of this nature. Courses similarly named differ in content, material covered, reading lists, degree of difficulty, student background and ability, and duration (quarter, semester, tri-mester, etc.). With these reservations in mind, Table II indicates the nature of the required coursework in the various programs.

The core requirements in planning usually consist of an introductory orientation to cities and urban problems; a theoretical perspective on planning; and basic planning and analytical techniques. Usually a four to eight course sequence comprises the core, and all planning students are expected to complete this. (The North Carolina sequence includes Introduction to Planning and Urbanism, Theory of Planning, Quantitative Methods for Planning, Planning Analysis and Design (a workshop), Planning Problems, and a required summer field assignment or internship.) Often these are thought of as the common ground between specialized planners -- those in transportation as well as housing or social policy inter-face around issues central to the core. In practice, however, the common ground of planning methods, techniques, and theory often proves elusive, elementary in content, and redundant, leading some schools to abolish any definition of required core courses completely (e.g. M.I.T.). In any case, debates about the content and viability of a

TABLE II: Core Requirements by Program

Program	Planning Core Required of all Students	Social Plan Core required of all Specializing	Electives Permitted Outside Specialization	Thesis
Florida State	Yes	Yes	6 courses*	Optional
Puerto Rico	Yes	Yes	3	None
U.N.C.	Yes	Yes	2-8 "	Optional
M.I.T.: MCP	No	No	Unlimited	Required
PH.D.	(see Note 1)			
Berkeley	(see Note 2)			

*Quarter system

NOTES: 1. M.I.T. Ph.D. program requires 2-6 terms residence, a special field exam, a general exam, thesis and oral defense.

2. Berkeley Ph.D. program requires 6 quarters residence, a first-year Program Review, Quantitative Methods exam, preliminary exams in three fields (planning theory, social policies planning, and a related outside field), oral qualifying exam, and thesis.

required core of courses is a permanent feature of planning schools, and many schools experiment with alternative formulations.

In developing a social policy planning option, most (M.I.T. again being an exception) programs require a second group of courses, representing the minimum social planning sequence considered mandatory of all electing the option. This constitutes a second "core" which all in the specialization share. The social planning core usually covers:

-- an introduction to social policy planning

--analysis and techniques for social planning

-- the politics of social planning, and

-- a workshop or field project in social policy problem area.

In addition, a course in law, social change and social action, may be required. Next, students are expected, but usually not required, to take a sequence of courses in a functionally specific area of social policy, in most cases housing or health planning.

With the two sets of required courses or cores, with some course work in a specific sector like housing, the student will have some slack in his schedule for additional courses, to be chosen on an elective basis. In most cases these can come from either within the planning department or from relevant departments throughout the university. Typically, it becomes a question of individual preference, and can take the direction of advanced work in methodology, work in economics or political science, organization theory, etc. The extent of outside work is difficult to generalize, but in those programs in this sample with required cores, an average of six courses are available for electives, representing a quarter to a third of the student's

course work over a two-year period.

Table III is a summary of social planning course offerings by program. The data must be read as an approximation because of the incommeasurability of the offerings. The entries do show the depth of course offerings in a particular area, as well as areas of common stress and areas where particular programs are visibly weak or thin. On the other hand, many courses which are not offered by a particular department are offered (or the material is covered) in other departments. At the same time, some courses in the department may duplicate offerings elsewhere in the university. In general, it would appear that courses designed as an integral part of the social policies sequence are more apt to contain material directly relevant to social policy problems and to the needs of social policy planners, including the examples and case studies used, the methods developed, and the applications proposed.

Table IV summarizes fieldwork and internship components for the sample of social planning programs.

Individual programs are detailed below. Appendix I includes complete course listings for all programs with expanded descriptions.

a. Florida State.

> Though interdisciplinary in nature, the planning curriculum is based on professional and theoretical planning courses offered by the planning faculty. The required core curriculum, 54 quarter hours, consists of courses in urbanism, planning theory and methods, and field planning problems, plus an internship (field training) in a planning office. The first year courses progress through a term of urban studies, a term of planning studies, a field planning problem, and the internship. In the second year, students concentrate in specializations, 21 quarter hours.[13]

The Department lists fifty-five courses, plus directed individual study and thesis entries, and six specializations (policy planning and

TABLE III: Course Offerings by Social Planning Program

(Designations refer to content; actual course titles vary from program to program)

X = offered

Note: The data must be read as an approximation because of the incommensurability of the offerings. The entries are intended to suggest the relative depth of course offerings relating to social policy planning programs within the Departments in question, as well as areas of common stress and areas where particular programs are visibly weak or thin.

Many courses not included in this compilation may be offered (or the material covered) elsewhere in the host department or in other departments. In general, however, it is assumed that offerings specifically designed for the social policy planning option are more likely to contain methods, case studies, and applications of direct relevance to the field than are courses designed in other contexts.

Course Designation	Florida	Puerto Rico	U.N.C.	Berkeley	M.I.T.
I. NORMATIVE THEORY AND POLICY ANALYSIS					
Social Policy Planning--Descriptive	X	X	X	X	X
Social Policy Planning--Analysis and Methods (single course)	X	X	X		X
a. Systems Analysis for the Public Sector				X	
b. Economic Analysis for Social Policy				X	
c. Operations Research				X	
Social Theory and Social Systems		X			
Social Services Planning		X			X
Social Indicators				X	

Table III (continued)

Course Designation	Florida	Puerto Rico	U.N.C.	Berkeley	M.I.T.
II. DECISION MAKING AND POLITICAL PROCESSES					
Law and Social Policy			X		X
Politics of Social Policy			X	X	
Behavioral Basis for Planned Change	X				
Man and Urban Environment	X			X	
Organization Theory			X		
National Social Policies				X	
Race					
Poverty					X
Urban History					X
III. SOCIAL CHANGE AND SOCIAL ACTION					
Dynamics of Social Change		X		X	X
Social Action		X			
Deliberate Social Change				X	X
Experiential Basis for Change/Use or Presentation of Self in Change	X			X	
IV. FUNCTIONAL SECTORS					
Health		X	X		X
Education		X	X	X	X
Housing	X	X			X
Social Services		X			X

Table III (Continued)

Course Designation	Florida	Puerto Rico	U.N.C.	Berkeley	M.I.T.
Welfare					
Manpower					
Community Development		X			X
V. FIELD PROJECTS					
Social Policy Planning Workshop (Applied Problem)		X	X		

TABLE IV: Fieldwork by Program

Program	Fieldwork Required	Fieldwork Supervised*	Academic Credit Received	Summer Internship Required	Summer Internship Supervised*
Florida State	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
Puerto Rico	To start summer 1971 Yes		No	Yes	No
U.N.C.	Optional	Proposed	No	Yes	No
Berkeley	Optional (most Ph.D. students do participate)				
M.I.T.	Optional	Yes	Yes	Yes	No

*Supervision is taken to mean active faculty participation in evaluating student role in project, site visits, and formal assessment. A student-written report may be an element of this, but does not constitute supervision.

intergovernmental relations, social planning, urban design, regional planning, transportation planning, and health planning). The social planning specialization lists five courses, plus a five-course housing sequence.

Appendix II indicates the basic two year sequence. Electives can be chosen from departmental or extra-departmental listings. Specialization electives would include the required core courses, plus sectoral courses from the department or other departments.

The original NIMH proposal outlined five core courses to be implemented: Social Planning Principles, Man and the Urban Environment, Behavioral Bases for Planned Change, Policy Planning for Social Change, and Physical Environment and Social Behavior. The five have been introduced, along with a sixth course, Experimental Foundations for Planning Practice.

b. Puerto Rico.

> The present social planning program at the Graduate Planning Program at the University of Puerto Rico requires two academic years with an 8 week internship during the intervening summer. A total of 20 courses adding to 68 credits, must be completed during the four semesters.

The department offers specializations in urban planning, economic planning, regional planning, and social planning.

Appendix II indicates the basic two-year sequence.

Four courses have been added in conjunction with the NIMH grant, and six other courses modified with its support.

c. North Carolina.

The social policy planning curriculum, as originally proposed in the NIMH application, was to include four courses that are part of the departmental required core: Introduction to Urbanism and Planning, Theory of Planning, Quantitative Methods, and Planning Analysis and Design. In

addition, eight courses were to be required of all students electing the social planning option. As of spring 1971 five new courses were added in conjunction with the NIMH grant (Social Policy Planning, Social Policy Analysis, Social Policy Field Work, The Politics of Plan Implementation, and Planning and Social Structure). In addition, a course in Law and Poverty was initiated along with the Law School, and two courses added to the housing sequence. Additional courses are planned health planning.

Appendix II indicates an illustrative program of study for a student electing a social policy planning option. As of 1971-1972, the core will be constructed differently, with one course in the history of planning thought required of all students, plus requirements in a variety of subject areas (six credits in theory, three in workshop, three in law, nine in methods, six in internship, three from other planning fields, and three from outside the area of specialization).

The course in Planning and the Ghetto, proposed in the NIMH application, has not been implemented to date.

d. Berkeley.

The Berkeley application to NIMH proposed a five course (quarter) sequence followed by an advanced seminar, for social policy students. The current listings for social planning offers eighteen quarter courses. In the Ph.D. program, a student is expected to pass three written examinations. One field, planning theory, is required of all students. A second field must be selected within city and regional planning, and social policy planning could comprise one of these specializations. A third field for

examination must be drawn from a related discipline, and the student must satisfy the same preliminary examination taken by majors in the other department. An oral qualifying examination is taken as a test of readiness to undertake a dissertation. The thesis is written under the guidance of a three member committee, which includes a faculty member from another department in the university.

Appendix II outlines an illustrative program of study.

e. M.I.T..

M.I.T. lists twelve courses under its social policy and governmental institutions option; the total departmental listing runs to sixty-nine courses (semester). For Master's candidates, "no program of required subjects is prescribed. Each student, whether through previous experience, formal subjects, or independent study. is expected to acquire an understanding of a core of fundamental knowledge and skills, and to develop a competence in some more specialized area." Specialization areas include social policy; housing, community development and urban economics; planning problems of developing areas; city design and spatial policy; quantitative methods and techniques for urban analysis, planning, and design; and additional specializations can be developed.

At the Ph.D. level, a student is expected to have a broad background in urban studies and perform advanced work in some area of specialization. Joint degree programs are possible with the Political Science and Economics Departments. The student must pass a special field examination, jointly constructed by the student and his advisor, and a general examination, con-

structed by a Ph.D. Guidance Committee composed of faculty and Ph.D. students.

f. Brandeis courses are included in Appendix I.

g. The two programs in public policy differ from the Master's level social planning programs described above in their stress on quantitative methods and analysis within a core curriculum.

Public Affairs at Berkeley offers a first-year core program "which is integrated through the process of team teaching and work on policy studies." Included are three quarters of decision theory and quantitative methods ("Students will develop skills in quantitative methods which will enable them to identify public policy issues amenable to quantitative analysis, to apply the appropriate methods, and to critically review existing studies using such methods."); three quarters on the political and organizational aspects of public policy "including the study of the structure and dynamics of public policy making systems in the United States; the processes involved in choosing among alternative politics, gaining acceptance for policies among relevant elites and public groups, ensuring acceptable implementation by public bureaucracies, and coping with the unanticipated consequences of new policies once implemented; and two quarters of economic analysis, including micro-economic and public expenditure theory." In the second year, students continue in a seminar of advanced policy analysis, which will lead into the preparation of a final policy study or Master's thesis. The remainder of the student's program will be filled out with elective courses from other departments or in the

school, and work in a substantive policy field and/or particular discipline is encouraged. During the summer between two years, students will serve an internship as policy apprentices with analysts in public organizations. Placements will be supervised.

The Public Policy Program at Harvard stresses a similar combination of quantitative and political analysis. The first year includes five core year-long courses: analytical methods, economic theory, statistical methods, political analysis, and a workshop involving the student in actual or prepared policy-making situations and integrating material from the other four courses. The second year students may elect courses from the program or other areas in the University. They are expected to supplement their analytic training and to concentrate, to the level of two full-year courses (four semester courses), in a functional area of policy such as education, medical care, welfare, etc. In addition the program encourages joint degree work, with other professional schools, especially law and medicine. Students do field work, in addition to applied workshop problems, as part of small "task forces" on existing problems in the public sector, and are expected to serve a summer internship.

2. Faculty. Faculty members bear the burden of implementing the objectives of these programs, and making the phraseology of course descriptions a reality. It is important, in considering these programs, to look at the range of faculty disciplines, background, and research or "applied" interests. The information which follows is meant to be suggestive of the range and depth of these dimensions, but with some important qualifications: labels do not really suit human beings, and subjective matters like personality, attitude,

and values, are of critical but undocumented importance; and secondly, much of this information will be rapidly out of date due to changes in personnel, etc. Data is presented first on a program-by-program basis, then a summary table will be used as the basis for generalization.

a. Florida State.

Table V provides information relating to faculty involved in the Florida State program.

In addition to those faculty members directly involved, other members of the department participate indirectly by teaching core planning courses. Faculty members from other departments (social welfare, sociology, psychology, social studies, education) are indicated as also participating in the program. NIMH funds allowed for visiting lecturers or consultants; while there is no breakdown by specialization, the department as a whole has had approximately thirty-five visiting lecturers during the grant period.

b. Puerto Rico.

Table VI provides information relating to faculty involved in the Puerto Rico program.

Other faculty in the department are associated indirectly with the program through joint planning workshop courses working on applied problems. Visiting professors and lecturers from sociology, education, planning, public health, social work, and social science supplement the participating faculty.

c. North Carolina.

Table VII provides information relating to faculty involved in the

TABLE V: Social Policy Planning Faculty: Florida State[a]

Position	Degree	Field	Undergrad. Field	Major Research Area	Publication (see Note b)	Extra-University Work
Assoc. Prof.	Ph.D. (pending).	City Planning	Architecture	Phys/Soc. Environment	* (Planning)	Planning-consulting, state government
Asst. Prof.	Ph.D. (pending)	Rural Sociology	Sociology	Planning; Community Theory	—	—
Assoc. Prof.	Ph.D.	Psychology	Psychology	Systems Design/ Personality Dev.	* (Planning, Behv. Science)	Admin/Research Public, Private
Asst. Prof.	Ph.D.	Rural Sociology	NA[c]	Social Theory; Research Method	—	—
Assoc. Prof. (Joint Appt., Psych.)	Ph.D.	Psychology	NA	Environment and Behavior	NA	Research-- Public, Private
Assoc. Prof. (Joint Appt., Psych.)	Ph.D.	Psychology	NA	Systems Simulation	NA	Research-- Public, Private
Res. Assoc.	MCP	City Planning	NA	Housing	—	Local Government, Public

[a] Includes department chairman.

Publications: * = moderate (occasional articles, reports: 1-5 items)
** = extensive (frequent articles, books/chapters, reports)
Items in parenthesis indicate type, e.g. planning journal, academic journal, U.N. report, etc.

NA = information not available

TABLE VI: Social Planning Faculty: Puerto Rico

Position	Degree	Field	Undergrad. Field	Major Research Area	Publication (see Note b, Table V)	Extra-University Work
Prof. (co-director)	Ph.D.	City Planning	Civil Engineering	City Planning, Transport Plan.	* (Planning)	Planning, Administration; Priv. Consultant
Prof. (co-director)	MCP	City Planning	Sciences	Housing, Ed., Development Strategies	** (Planning, U.N.)	National and State Government, Planning, Administration
Prof.	Ph.D.	City Planning	Sociology	Social Planning, Methods	** (Planning, U.N.)	Research
Asst. Prof.	Ph.D. (pending)	City Planning	Engineering	Social Planning and Action	—	—

TABLE VII: Social Policy Planning Faculty: North Carolina

Position	Degree	Field	Undergrad. Field	Major Research Area	Publication (see Note b, Table V)	Extra-University Work
Prof., Chairman	MCP	City Planning	Architecture	Planning, Urban Dev.	* (Planning)	Planning Consultant
Assoc. Prof.	Ph.D.	City Planning	Sociology	Social Planning	* (Planning)	Planning, Research
Assoc. Prof.	Ph.D.	City Planning	Political Science	Housing	** (Planning)	—
Assoc. Prof.	Ph.D.	Social Welfare	NA	Social Planning, Social Change, Research	** (Planning, Social Work)	Research, Public
Assoc. Prof.	Ph.D.	Social Welfare	NA	Health Planning	—	Research, Administration, State Government

TABLE VIII: Social Policy Planning Faculty: Berkeley

Position	Degree	Field	Undergrad. Field	Major Research Area	Publication	Extra-University Work
Prof., Chairman	Ph.D.	Regional Science	Economics Geography	Regional Analysis; Economic Analysis of Urban Services	* (Planning, Regional Science)	Consultant, Public, Private
Prof.	MCP	City Planning	NA	City Planning	** (Planning)	Private, Public
Prof.	MD	Psychiatry	NA	Deliberate Social Change	* (Social Change)	Consulting, Administration Public, Private
Prof., Joint with Public Health	MD, MPH	Public Health, Planning	NA	Community Health and Planning	*	Research, Administration, State and Local Government
Prof.	Ph.D.	Regional Science	NA	Regional Analysis	** (Planning, Regional Science)	—
Prof.	Ph.D.	City Planning	Education	Planning Theory; Development Strategy	** (Planning)	Research, Consulting; Public Private, International

TABLE VIII: (continued)

Position	Degree	Field	Undergrad. Field	Major Research Area	Publication	Extra-University Work
Asst. Prof.	Ph.D.	Political Economy	NA	Economics and Social Structure	*	NA
Prof., Joint with Law	LL.B.	Law	NA	Law and Planning	NA	NA
Visiting Lecturer	BA	Social Policy	NA	Social Policy	** (Social Policy, Research, Practice)	Research
Prof.	Ph.D.	City Planning		Environmental Design, Devel. Strategies	** (Planning)	Consulting-Research, Public, Private
Lecturer	Ph.D.	Systems Analysis	NA	Systems Analysis for Planning	*	NA

TABLE IX: Social Policy Planning Faculty: M.I.T.

Position	Degree	Field	Undergrad. Field	Major Research Area	Publication	Extra-University Work
Prof., Chairman	Ph.D.	City Planning	NA	Development Policy	** (Planning, Development Areas)	Administration, Consulting; International
Prof.	Ph.D.	City Planning	NA	Social Planning, Housing	** (Planning)	Consulting, Government
Prof.	Ph.D.	Social Welfare	NA	Social Policy	** (Social Policy)	NA
Assoc. Prof.	Ph.D.	Urban Anthropology	NA	Social Planning, Poverty, Education	** (Planning)	Community, Local Government; Development Areas
Assoc. Prof.	Ph.D.	Urban History	NA	Institutional Change	**	—
Visiting Prof.	Ph.D.	Manage-ment	NA	Social Change	**	Private, Public
Assistant Prof.	Ph.D.	City Planning	NA	Health Planning	—	Private

TABLE X: Social Planning Faculty, All Programs

Program	Faculty Field						Research & Publication		Extra University Activities				
	City[1] Plan	Econ./ Syst. Anal.	Soc[2] Sci.	Behav.[3] Sci.	Soc.Wrk./ Welfare	Other	Basic	Applied[4]	Planning Priv.[5]	Consultation Government Neighborhood	State	Local Nat.	Administration
Fla. St.	1	-	2	3	-	-	2	3	3	-	2	1	-
Puerto R.	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	3	1	1
U.N.C.	2	-	-	-	2	-	1	3	-	-	3	-	1
Berkeley	5	1	2	1	-	2	3	8	5	-	6	-	2
M.I.T.	3	-	2	-	1	-	2	4	2	1	2	1	1
TOTALS	15	1	6	4	3	2	8	21	10	1	16	3	5

NOTES:

1. Includes city planning, regional science and planning.
2. Includes sociology, anthropology, history.
3. Includes psychology, social psychology, psychiatry.
4. The distinction between basic and applied is approximate at best. It is meant to imply the difference between "basic" research, conceptualization and analysis, of political, social, economic issues, institutions, etc. and "applied" work featuring plans, recommendations, and policies.
5. Includes research and consultation for private firms, Rand-like organizations, etc.

North Carolina program.

Other faculty associated indirectly with the social policy program come from elsewhere in the planning department, and from university departments of law, public administration, health sciences, environmental sciences and engineering, and political science. No formal advisory committee structure has been initiated.

d. Berkeley.

Table VIII provides information relating to faculty involved in the Berkeley program.

In addition faculty from education, public affairs, business administration, political science, and elsewhere in the city planning department are formally associated with the social policies program.

e. M.I.T.

Table IX provides information relating to faculty involved with the social planning option at M.I.T.

f. Table X presents summary data for social planning faculty involved in all five programs.

The figures suggest several observations.

In varying forms, each program describes itself as interdisciplinary, policy oriented, and socially concerned. The programs clearly vary in the degree to which their faculties reflect a range of disciplines. Summing disciplines represented on the faculty of each program, Puerto Rico would rate 1 (all faculty from city planning backgrounds); North Carolina, 2; Florida State, 3; M.I.T., 5; and Berkeley, 8.

Taken as a whole (as reflected in Table X), faculty drawn from city

planning backgrounds clearly predominate (as would be expected in departments of city planning). Disciplines representing the "hard" areas of methodology and techniques, economic analysis, etc., are conspicuously missing. Berkeley is the only program to include this, as can be confirmed by reference to Table III. (Again, just because this discipline is not included in the social policy specialization in a particular department does not mean that it is not available elsewhere in the department or in the university. It may mean, however, that course treatments offered elsewhere will not necessarily place special emphasis on social policy issues.) While the range of disciplines represented in these programs may appear large when compared with a standard academic department (where, at one level, everyone is a sociologist, for example), it is about standard for departments of city and regional planning, which have traditionally included a mix of faculty backgrounds. There are other gaps. M.I.T. is the only program able to offer work in urban history. Social class analysis is treated only minimally. Research or course work in race and racism is not represented.

A second observation is related to the amount of attention directed towards basic as opposed to applied research. Unlike science, where the distinction is relatively clear-cut, there is no easy way to distinguish the two in the area of planning and social policy. What is intended, however, is to differentiate between fundamental research, conceptualization, and analysis of social policy issues and areas, on the one hand, and applied planning work which is concerned with making recommendations, policies, or evaluating specific programs. With this distinction in mind,

the bulk of the work in the social planning programs in question could be considered applied: concerned with problems and solutions more than the generation of new knowledge, concepts, or theory. The largest single source of publication would be the Journal of the American Institute of Planners, the professional association of city planners. Publication in academic journals is relatively rare. Similarly, basic work in poverty, income maintenance, race, social class analysis, behavior and the environment, is taking place outside these programs (and outside city planning departments). Basic work in quantitative analysis and the application of quantitative analytical and decision techniques is also taking place outside of these programs.

Third, the pattern of outside work (the Tables include both present and past involvement) shows: only one faculty member involved at the neighborhood level; the large majority (twenty-six of thirty-five entries) involved in planning consultation and applied research, under half for private firms or Rand - A.D. Little type organizations, more than half with state or national government; relatively little involvement at the local (city) level; and relatively little actual administrative (as opposed to consultant) experience.

A final point concerns the role of an advisory committee or a similar organizational form to extend the resources of the particular program and to institutionalize efforts at inter-disciplinary training. All the programs displayed regular contact with faculty from outside the host department (city planning), usually in the form of joint appointments, released time, etc., and the four NIMH aided projects reported consultation with outside faculty in the planning stages of the program. But at present, there are

advisory committees or the equivalent forms active in enlarging participation by the larger university community. There were no instances where faculty outside the host department had an official voice in program policy and design.

3. Students. Students in these programs, taken together, constitute a diverse lot, in terms of academic background, work experience, and goals. Academic backgrounds include sociology, political science, economics, history, engineering, fine arts, history, education, mathematics. While most students are coming directly from undergraduate programs, perhaps a quarter have had a period of outside experience: Peace Corps, several years working for the government, and in a few cases, a sharp break between previous work in, for example, science/engineering and a subsequent decision to return to graduate school in a social planning program.

There has been no attempt in this study to compare students among the various programs, presumably with whatever GRE or College Board scores might be relevant. Aside from being a major undertaking in itself, it is unclear what the results would tell. All programs report similar admissions policies -- a mixture of students who have demonstrated previous high level academic performance, or varied backgrounds in terms of work experience or previous area of concentration, or who have definite career goals and objectives and have evidenced that they can act on them. While there is no such thing as a typical student, examples of "promising" candidates are described in two NIMH grant applications:

BN completed the A.B. degree in anthropology at Vassar, then took an M.A. in social anthropology at Columbia. Follwing her divorce, she came to us as the mother of three children. Confident of her abilities and determined to pursue her own firmly established interests, she resisted the technical courses and sought to map out her own degree program..She was permitted to vary her program from our norm, and we are now pleased that she did. While a student, she lived in San Francisco where she spent two years as a participant-observer of the local poverty program...upon completion of her Master's degree, she was awarded the contract to recommend an administrative reorganization for the local poverty program, having been selected from a panel that included some of the major consulting firms in the nation.[14]

* * * *

HH, a Negro, is a native of New Haven, and a graduate of Yale with a major in Philosophy. As an undergraduate student, he worked with the Northern Student Movement to set up tutorial projects for the disadvantaged students in the ghettos of Baltimore, was employed as an intern with Community Progress, Inc., and was an intern with the New Haven city government. His interests in educational problems among the disadvantaged led him, upon graduation in 1965, to accept a position with the Southern Education Foundation which assigned him to Shaw University....while at Shaw he helped develop proposals for the funding of a computer center, the development of an Upward Bound program, and most recently has been working with others to develop a school of urban sciences....[15]

In displaying a diverse background and a variety of previous experience, students in the social policy planning programs differ very little from students in planning schools in general. The back-ground of architecture or engineering traditionally associated with planning schools has been supplanted during the past decade by more people from social science -- humanities undergraduate areas. There is no evidence, either, that social planning students are more socially conscious or activist than their counterparts in other planning specializations. Which is to say, within these programs as well as within planning schools, there is a

range of students who would run from low to high in social consciousness, political assumptions, or activism (here taken to mean organizational activity motivated by political or social concern: NAACP, SDA, urban field service, political parties, etc.).

The only difference between social planning students and students in other planning specializations that appears is a tendency towards less background in mathematics, statistics, and quantitative methods, but within each program there are notable exceptions.

Proportions of black students, and women, in the social planning programs are roughly equivalent to the proportions in the departments as a whole: Puerto Rico, 11 male, 6 female, no figures by race; North Carolina, 20 male, 10 female, and in the department as a whole, 20 black students (1971-72); Berkeley, 15 make, 3 female, 1 black student in the social planning program; M.I.T., 19 male, 10 female, figures on race not available.

As indicated above, there is no data on student "quality" by program, however measured. In general, however, the Ph.D.-level programs could be expected to be more selective; in the case of Berkeley and M.I.T., both are at present national in their attraction. In the master's programs, North Carolina competes with Pennsylvania, M.I.T., Cornell, Berkeley, Harvard, Columbia for student applications. Florida State is now beginning to draw students from outside the Florida-Georgia region. Puerto Rico, of course, draws predominantly Puerto Ricans. Generalizations of this order say nothing about the abilities of individual students, and presumably these vary within programs.

4. Evaluation. The four programs aided by NIMH each stressed evaluation in their applications: monitoring progress towards stated objectives, keeping tabs on graduates, etc. To date, no program has operationalized its proposed evaluation procedures. Some programs have submitted progress reports to the funding agency, but these are not the equivalent of critical evaluations.

Evaluation of these programs -- or any educational program for that matter -- is admittedly difficult, both in the methodology of specifying inputs and outputs, and operationally, where time and resources are limited. And, of course, the real impact of an educational program may occur many years later (when careers peak, when books are written, etc.).

a. Florida State proposed, in addition to periodic faculty review and formal and informal student feedback, self-evaluation aimed at answering the following questions:

-- does the program compare in enrollment growth to other established specialties?

-- does this program attract students from other programs?

-- are other departments in the university responding with curricula offerings related to the program?

-- how attractive are the graduates in this specialty to prospective employers compared to other graduates?

-- are there detectable changes in the operations of the agencies in which graduates are employed that can be attributed to the training received?[16]

b. Puerto Rico proposed that "a systematic effort should be made to interview graduates in order to check what knowledge has been useful in their jobs or is missing but demanded by their activities. We also feel that agency officials should be systematically interviewed to determine whether the areas of major concern have shifted and the training program needs readjustment. To this effect the proposed program contemplates a systematic evaluation effort beginning the first year after graduating the first group of trainees and continuing systematically during every summer period through surveys and faculty seminars with the help of consultants." [17]

c. North Carolina proposed four intermediate to long-run evaluation approaches:

> (first)....to evaluate the performance of our social policy planners in their professional capacities; the second concerns the nature of our student selection procedures; the third attempts to evaluate the degree to which our social policy planning specialists can interact with different groups within the community in order to bring about satisfactory solutions to difficult and perplexing problems; and finally, the fourth component....involves an attempt to relate our academic program to the needs of urban society, as determined by the "best minds" in the field of social policy planning.[18]

At the heart of the evaluation procedure, the program proposes relating "success criteria" regarding the performance of graduates as estimated by faculty, professional supervisors, peers, and client populations to quantified student characteristics in hopes of developing a predictive link between student selection and professional performance. The program also proposed a series of short-run measures, including the comparative rates of increase in applications in the

department and social policy planning program; the degree to which graduate students in other disciplines elect to take courses in social planning; the degree to which the program influences other graduate programs in city planning; the intensity of recruitment of graduates, and their relative salaries.

d. Berkeley proposed a series of "short run clues to effectiveness," including the attractiveness of the program to high-quality students; whether the program attracts transfers from other programs; whether the students and faculty are more respected in their contact with city halls and target populations than other university-based professionals; whether adjustments are being made in the curricula of other departments and professional schools at Berkeley and in other universities in response to the program; whether graduates are sought for appointments elsewhere; whether any of the ideas developed in this program were readily transformed into programs for developing areas; what change could be detected in the operation of the agencies in which graduates are employed; and calculation of secondary benefits to public programs resulting from student involvement and faculty consultation. This information would be gathered by conducting surveys of agency operations and by monitoring enrollment and curricula.

D. Program Performance

The basic questions in estimating performance are: How have these programs worked in practice? Has progress been made towards the educational objectives which were proposed? Have commitments been fulfilled?

What evidence is there, granting the short time the programs have been in operation, that graduates are performing to expectations?

In some cases these questions can be answered objectively: an evaluation program either has or has not been carried out. In other cases, the answers are of the nature of approximations. They represent responses to questions posed in interviews, and in many cases within a given program assessments offered by participants varied, or were contradictory. Almost all social policy planning faculty involved in these programs were interviewed (exceptions being those on leave or otherwise unavailable at the time of the site visits); a sample of students was interviewed. In both cases interviews lasted from one to two hours and in the case of faculty, follow-up interviews were frequently scheduled. Opinions cited below are representative of faculty or students interviewed, but no attempt is made to provide statements like "all faculty felt that...." or "60 percent of the students feel that...." Methodologically, the concern here is not to replicate the distribution of opinions and attitudes, but to use these opinions and attitudes to help identify those factors which facilitate or inhibit the functioning of these programs.

Two general observations override many of the more specific considerations of program performance that follow below.

One, in all programs, while there was evidence of firm conviction on the part of faculty members involved that social policy planning was an important and valid area of enquiry and training, there was a great deal of difficulty in specifying just what was meant by social

planning, what social planners would in fact do, and how social planners would be effective. Nor is this simply a question of a variety of opinions. What is being noted is the lack of precision and specificity underlying most notions of what social planning is all about (whatever form that notion may take). Interestingly, this situation contrasts with that of the programs in public policy, where sharply bounded definitions and objectives were indicated. The issue here is not good or bad definitions, but the relative absence of definitions and boundaries in social planning.

While the evidence is sketchy, one interpretation of this situation is that the elusive nature of what social planning is all about is rooted in the lack of practical or theoretical insight into what the policy process is, how are social policy planning decisions made, and accordingly, which are the leverage points where professionals with appropriate skills can be effective? This interpretation is supported by the kind of evidence discussed in Table X, above; taken as a body, the faculty of these programs has had relatively little experience in terms of actual policy or administrative responsibility. It should not be surprising, then that the programs they staff reflect this in curricula and general orientation.

In contrast to the social planning programs, the programs in public policy have a set of statements which answer these questions. They say, in effect, this is what we think the process is, and here is where we can be effective. There are, I would argue, good reasons to doubt whether the rationale is adequate (major constraints are exercised by the nature of social problems and their measurement, and by the political and administrative realities of quantitative analysis, for example). But the test will be empirical, and the public policy programs, in basing their objectives on

cause and effect statements, lend themselves to empirical verification in a way that the social planning programs, with imprecise goals and unclear means, do not.

I will return to this problem in Section III, but it is worth noting at this point as a background theme to the evaluation of the performance of these programs. In large part, I would argue that this situation arises because of the nature of the faculties involved in these programs: the particular kind of outside experience they have had, as a group, and the division of labor between applied and basic research, favoring the former, do not, in general, provide a basis for a clear notion of the policy process and appropriate leverage points in it.

This is not meant to be critical, but as an interpretation of data. If substantiated, it does not constitute a condemnation, but a recommendation for testing which, if confirmed, suggests a reordering of priorities: towards more basic research and analysis of policy decisions, towards recruitment of faculty with policy experience, and towards a reduced "professional city planning" orientation.

The second general observation is in many ways complementary to the first. While all these programs derive their rationale from the persistence of a series of social/urban problems, there is little evidence of this rationale in the actual activities of the individual programs. There is a tendency for these problems to be lost in the more constricted area of programs and methods. In other words, from an initial concern for particular problems, attention rapidly shifts alternative means and

delivery systems. Problems are not in general viewed systematically in terms of either epistemology, history or society (social structural). Aside from constituting a notable gap in the conceptual basis of most programs, a direct result of this is the lack of a sense of urgency which pervades many of these programs. Again, I will return to these questions in Section III, Patterns of Thought, and will supply what evidence there is in terms of specific aspects of performance included below.

1. Florida State.

Among the social planning faculty, there appeared to be general agreement that the social planning program had successfully accomplished its major goal: to sensitize physical planners to social variables. In doing so, the department had considerably added to the diversity of its faculty and broadened its course offerings. There was a general sense that in meeting its goal of training socially sensitive physical planners, the department was encouraging the interaction of economic, social and physical planners.

There was less consensus about the "next steps." There was again a general feeling, stated most strongly by the chairman, that the basic core of the specialization--behavior and the environment--could be expanded, while at the same time more attention could be directed at the more functional operating areas of social policy like aging, etc. This would appear to be a shift from a specific social planning conception to one which dealt with social issues wherever they appeared in all substantive areas of planning.

Faculty conceptions of the actual roles and skills involved in this

new role, if indeed it can be called a role, were varied and somewhat vague. Part of the motive for the shift in emphasis may stem from some of the weaknesses identified in the program as it has operated to date. Among factors cited by the faculty were a general weakness in methodology on the part of social planning students and in the curriculum, the need to develop better ways of using data in social planning, and the need in training social planners to stress more analytic tools and skills and place more emphasis on evaluation. There was, in addition, a feeling expressed by the chairman, that feedback regarding social planning on the job suggested that the profession was not yet ready for social planning as an innovation, and that planners would continue to face jobs in conventional agency settings. At the same time, within the program, this same shift in emphasis was reinforced in the faculty view by changing student backgrounds. Originally, the program stressed the social impact of physical plans which was consistent with the physical design background of the students. In the past two years, however, students were described as being more socially concerned, from a social science background, and more interested in social change, and social programs in planning.

The feeling that students were weak on methodology was general throughout the department faculty. Instead, the program stressed the sensitivity of the graduates, and their ability to pull together new elements and to innovate--in other words, to combine the traditional image of the planner as broker, pulling together and developing new programmatic elements with an awareness of social sensitivity. The future direction for the department, in this view, should include stress

on functional planning skills and solid grounding in substantive areas like housing. This group saw planners as working more in project development and social service management within existing agencies.

The social science faculty, chiefly those from psychology, tended more to the emerging view of the social planner as a "participant conceptualizer" provides feedback for new decisions, rules, develops new indicators, identifies new problems, and "orchestrates" other members of the planning team. This provision of information -- the participant conceptualizer shares information about how the system operates -- is the key to his functioning. In accord with this model, the department would stress more methodology including simulation and modeling, and decision making, and more basic work on the application of psychological concepts, like needs, to the environment and planning.

These two views would appear to exist in tension within the department: the participant conceptualizer view clearly derives from the research and outside experience of the behavioral scientists in the department (including work with RAND on systems analysis and simulation, applying Maslow-type need components to a planning agency practice, and behavioral research). The planning view is consistent with the original objectives of the social planning program and is consistent with the perception of the outside job market.

Students. Students interviewed came from a variety of social science-humanities undergraduate majors and, as a group, looked ahead to jobs in general-purpose city planning agencies. Most accepted planning school as a necessary step towards planning jobs, but were not overly

enthusiastic about their work there. There was a general feeling that "planning can't be taught, it's something you pick up on the job." They felt the methods courses were either not applicable (not practical for actual agency operations) or lacked content. Most felt the core requirements were unnecessary; they should be able to choose their own courses and programs. All felt comfortable about working "within the system"; many used "disjointed incrementalism" as their model of how things got done, but felt planning should be more oriented to "results." Interestingly, most cited idealism as the reason they were in planning school; some felt they had become more activist during their time in planning school. Students felt they had little role in making decisions regarding departmental policy affecting them.

Curriculum. Five courses were initiated with NIMH funds. These serve as an introduction to social planning, but are thin in terms of methodology, analysis, history, institutional analysis, and social change. Only two substantive areas, housing and health, have been developed.

Some overlap of courses has developed with the School of Social Welfare, which has been moving towards a social planning-community organization focus. Students from psychology and sociology came in for courses within the planning department. Additional courses have not been added to the initial sequence, to date.

Fieldwork involved social planning students for ten hours a week, mainly in the State Division of Youth Services, health planning agencies, and city and county government. Because of the location of the school in a small city, placements were difficult to find. Faculty members

estimated that only those students with a specialized background--e.g. in health care--could become sufficiently involved to make the fieldwork a valuable educational experience.

Formal evaluation of the NIMH program had not been performed. Faculty discussions and student feedback were substituted for any formal review of program and graduate performance as a basis for making decisions about the program.

Tables XI and XII indicate job placements of social planning graduates by program. Florida State placements have been predominantly in traditional planning agencies at the local or state level. Most placements are within the region. There is no evidence that suggests that these graduates are performing markedly different from graduates in other programs. They are not staffing Model Cities or OEO operations. Within traditional agencies, it can only be presumed that they function as socially sensitive planners.

In the terms of its stated objectives, the Florida State program has provided planners with an exposure to social services, social factors in housing, and social action and policy. How much this exposure makes a planner--or the profession in general--socially sensitive is impossible to say. It does not appear to have changed their basic job orientation towards traditional planning agencies. As with other programs, much of the present curriculum, as taught, is of background value, but cannot be applied at present directly to social problems. (For example, behavioral science definitions of fundamental human needs may broaden a planner's awareness or sensitize him, but do not constitute a readily available tool which he can apply on the job.)

TABLE XI: Social Planning Graduate Job Placements, by Program*

Placement	Program Fla.St.	P.R.	U.N.C.	Berkeley (Ph.D.)	MIT (Ph.D)	Total
Planning agency/ commission						
local	4	1	4	-	-	9
state	5	-	-	-	-	5
HUD: regional						
Federal	-	-	-	-	-	-
Executive Asst. Mayor's Office	-	-	1	-	1	2
Neighborhood	-	-	-	-	-	-
OEO/Model Cities	-	1	-	-	-	1
Teaching/Research	-	4	2	1	1	8
Other Government Agencies (FHA, HEW, St.-Fed.)	1	3	-	-	-	4
Other planning	1	-	-	-	-	1
Continuing Education	-	2	-	-	-	2
Other (army, etc.)	1	-	2	-	-	3

*March 1971

TABLE XII: Placements, by Location, Agency, and Program

Florida State

1. Planner, Charlotte, North Carolina, N. C. Planning Commission
2. Director of Social Service, Federal Housing Administration, Department of Housing and Urban Development, Birmingham, Alabama.
3. United States Army
4. Senior Planner, Tampa Bay Regional Planning Commission, Tampa, Florida
5. Planner, Brevard County Planning Commission, Titusville, Florida
6. Senior Planner, Department of Natural Resources, State of Florida
7. Senior Planner, State Office of Planning and Programming, State of Nebraska
8. Planner, Miami-Dade Metropolitan Planning Commission, Miami, Florida
9. State Planning Office, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania
10. Division of State Planning and Community Affairs, Richmond, Virginia
11. Planner, Diocese of Florida, Jacksonville, Florida
12. Office of State Planning, Hartford, Connecticut

Puerto Rico

13. Planning Specialist, Puerto Rico Board of Education
14. Planning Specialist, Puerto Rico Board of Education
15. Graudate Program in Planning, Research Assistant, University of Puerto Rico
16. Ph.D., Berkeley, California
17. Professor, Community Development Institute and School of Medicine, University of Puerto Rico

TABLE XII: (continued)

18. Planner, Research Division, Urban Renewal and Housing Administration, Puerto Rico

19. Planner, Model City Project, San Juan, Puerto Rico

20. Planner, Puerto Rico Agricultural Experimental Station, Puerto Rico

21. Educational Planner, Department of Education, Puerto Rico

22. Educational Planner, Department of Education, Puerto Rico

23. Ph.D., Cornell

University of North Carolina

24. U. S. Army

25. Urban Studies Center, Portland State University, Portland, Oregon

26. Planner, Cambridge Planning Board, Cambridge, Massachusetts

27. Planner, Department of Planning, Baltimore, Maryland

28. Center for Urban and Regional Studies, University of North Carolina

29. Planner, Human Resources Administration, New York City

30. Planner, New York City Planning Commission, New York City

31. Planning Division, Office of Mayor, Chicago, Illinois

Berkeley (Ph.D.)

32. Research Director, Institute of Human Studies, Boston College

M.I.T. (Ph. D.)

33. Housing Analyst, Mayor's Office, Boston, Massachusetts

34. Assistant Professor, Urban Studies and Planning, M.I.T.

2. Puerto Rico

With less than a year behind it, it would be difficult to assess fairly the progress of the Puerto Rican program towards meeting its objectives. In many ways, it has taken on more of a burden than the other Master's programs considered here. It has placed emphasis on the development of an appropriate methodology for social policy planning; on the development of methods and approaches which are appropriate to the context of a small developing economy; and on the concurrent treatment of social planning in both a societal and sectorial context. This takes place in an atmosphere politically charged by the independence movement. Working against these efforts, in a sense, is the fact that the existing planning bureaucracy, into which most graduates have gone and presumably will continue to go, resembles traditional planning agencies in the United States. There is, therefore, a tension between the stress in the educational program on critical analysis, innovative planning roles and anti-establishment values, and the opportunities for planners as middle-level technicians and bureaucrats in Puerto Rican government. This tension is a clear source of frustration to planning students. There doesn't appear to be any resolution; in Puerto Rico, faculty acknowledge that students should be prepared to work within established planning channels or outside them, but identifiable models and roles are not forthcoming. (In contrast, the other programs considered here base their efforts solely on the assumption of working within established planning channels. Planning students in these programs, however, are frequently subject to the

same kind of frustration: in both cases, the tension is present; but only in the Puerto Rican case is it dealt with explicitly.)

Social planning, in the Puerto Rican case, is approached as a complex process, involving not just socially sensitive planners, as in the Florida case, but planners functioning in a variety of roles: sectoral planning, collaborative work on social aspects of other plans, societal level planning, and social and political action.

As a group, the social planning faculty are concerned with developing an inductive approach to planning, working from particular problems and clients towards a general systems perspective. This is seen as an attempt to go beyond what is viewed as the dominant American mode, empiricism, and to develop a historical, politicized view of society, in which the social planner serves to explain existing reality, to "problematicize the existence of the people," and to develop social policy which resynthesizes reality with appropriate solutions. All courses share the stress on critical analysis that this implies. At the same time, there is an effort to develop or adapt methods which are appropriate for social planning, including client analysis, participant observation, survey techniques, and community studies.

The ideal student for recruitment to the program is from an activist background, "oriented to the street," and able to work through organizations. Accordingly, the thrust of planning education is to keep this activism, but operationalize it by adding new skills.

At the moment, the department is divided into two camps, with the social planning group and the economic planners on different sides. The latter tend to see social planning as soft and non-quantitative,

with too general a focus to be effective. The economists would propose, in place of the social planning program, a school of public policy. The distinction between social and economic planning, in my view, is artificial. The focus might rather be on theory and concepts than on bureaucratic techniques which reflect existing administrative practices that will rapidly become obsolete.

Among students interviewed, satisfaction with the program varied. In general, those with some outside experience, and a definite idea of what they wanted to do, were more satisfied: in their terms, they came looking for a set of skills (social survey techniques, analytic methods), and were able to get them. Those who came for less specific reasons tended to react to the ambiguity of the field of social (and city) planning and to the prospects for graduates, which they saw in terms of bureaucracy. The student body was varied in composition, with a strong orientation to Latin America. The issues surrounding dependency on the United States shape political consciousness in much the same way the Vietnam war has shaped the consciousness of American students: although there might be disagreement, it was continually present as a source of debate.

The course offerings in the Puerto Rican program stressed methods, social theory, social (societal) change, and social action.. In many respects the program appears more coherent than others in this study, but it is probably necessary to question the depth of content of the courses. The content of many courses might be described as exposure to techniques and/or issues, but not mastery (e.g., being exposed to problems and issues in survey research is different from actually learning to carry out survey re-

search.

The apparent thinness of some of the offerings may be explained by the need, which the program explicitly addresses, to develop new teaching materials, case studies, etc. Courses were supplemented, however, with projects in the field--barrios, slum communities, etc.--with the outside experience highlighting, often in imaginative ways, specific problems raised in the context of regular course work (e.g. rapport, interview techniques, etc.). The international nature of the program tended to affect the curriculum positively, bringing in European and Latin American sources, materials and visiting lecturers. This contrasts noticeably with the other programs in the sample which approach the subject almost exclusively in its American context. On the other hand, too, most students interviewed were currently engaged in an outside research project, working in conjunction with a faculty member on a sophisticated project (examples: a major restudy of the role of the cooperative movement being performed for the Puerto Rico Cooperative Society; a Delphic survey of future technological and social developments on the island). In these projects, students were involved to the point of developing their own skills to generate and carry out research. At the same time they were working closely with a faculty member and, because of the nature of faculty experience, through them enjoyed access to a number of resource people, leaders, planners and politicians. Some sevemty-five students from other departments are cross-registered in planning courses.

Summer fieldwork projects, under close faculty supervision, were to

start in 1971 with placements in a variety of agencies, neighborhoods, and slum areas.

No formal evaluation has taken place to date.

The job placements of graduates of the program are indicated in Tables XI and XII (these are graduates from the program as it was developed before NIMH support was available: the first graduates of the current, fully developed program will be in June 1972). Social planners have gone to a variety of government agencies, including housing, health, and education. A portion have continued on to Ph.D. level work elsewhere, and an estimated quarter of the graduates are teaching in Puerto Rican regional colleges. The department estimates that some 10 percent of its graduates are performing active work, utilizing their planning skills, with political parties. This level of activity is surprisingly high when compared with that of graduates from American planning schools.

In terms of its stated objectives--combining micro-and macro- social perspectives, developing techniques and materials relevant to a developing area, training planners for a variety of roles--the program appears to be making good progress. A major asset is the faculty with extensive outside experience in both research and administration.

3. North Carolina.

Within the social policy planning faculty, there is unified agreement on the goals and character of the program. The common denominator is "effectiveness," the sense that social planners are being trained to be eclectic in their tools and strategies, and practical in calculating political feasibility and their ability to affect the system. Presumably this represents some middle ground between naive technocrats and impractical utopians. The

social planner, in this view, has a general competence based on his technical skills, chief among which is his ability to apply an analytic framework to a variety of problems, and political skills in decision making. As a group the faculty stress working within the system. When compared with other programs, however, they have somewhat limited outside experience, especially in the policy making area.

At the same time, there is a feeling among some faculty involved in the program that there is (1) lack of a clear focus to the social planning program, (2) lack of a clear idea how social policy decisions are made, especially at the local level where most social planners will work, and (3) that the program is weak in the area of the context of social problems, especially race and poverty.

Indeed, within the initial NIMH application, great stress was placed on the proposed role of the course in planning and the "ghetto," in ghetto-based field projects, and in preparing planners to work in the ghetto. ("Two assumptions underlie our decision to emphasize field training in the ghetto as the most important aspects of the program. First we believe the ghetto....to be the primary target for the efforts of the local social policy planner. Second, we believe that it is impossible to acquire an adequate understanding of the ghetto in the classroom alone; hence the need for an experiential training process.") To date the course has not been introduced and fieldwork projects have not been programmed.

Among the departmental faculty, there is some disagreement as to the impact of the social planning program on the rest of the department.

While some feel it has had little effect, others argue that other specializations--especially the urban systems sequence--have turned in a more policy-oriented direction in response. It would be extremely difficult to determine whether the increased policy orientation is linked to the social planning program, or is a concurrent development with both specializations influenced by a general return to policy in a variety of academic programs.

Along with the emphasis on effectiveness in the social planner's role, the department is often described as being strongly oriented to success as measured by the positions, prestige, and relative salaries commanded by graduates. Much of this information represents informal feedback, through the chairman, and in the absence of any formal evaluation of the social planning program, is presumably the chief way in which the option is judged.

The faculty see the program as requiring some shift in emphasis after two years of operation, dropping survey and introductory level discussions of social issues, and moving to place more emphasis on the context (e.g. race and poverty), on sectors (health and housing are the present two functional areas, with education and manpower eventually to be added), on process work in community organization and citizen participation, and on hard analysis of social planning problems. While this will fill gaps in the program as presently conceived, it will not answer the criticism of some faculty and students: the program places too much stress on service delivery and participation, without probing how the system operates, or how priorities are set.

Students interviewed at North Carolina, more so than any place else, divided into two distinct attitude groupings concerning the social planning

program. One group expressed satisfaction with the program in terms of two dimensions: exposure and flexibility. This group found opportunity within the structure of the program to pick up a range of basic technical planning skills--like land use and zoning, housing analysis, etc.--which had practical relevance to their future planning work. In addition, they liked the exposure to a variety of social policy planning substantive areas--housing, education, welfare--as these were touched upon in the core courses. They did not want, and were not pressured to acquire, in-depth specialization in one of these substantive areas, or in advanced methodological work. In almost all cases, this was explained in terms of the practical experience the student went through during his internship (the summer work experience), which was in an established planning agency. Students returned from this with a sense of what they wanted from the second-year curriculum, more critical of planning school offerings, and with a feeling that work in school is somewhat unrealistic in terms of what happens on the job: "Anyone can do planning;" there is no place on the job for advanced statistics or methods; there is a tremendous discrepancy between planning education and practice, especially in dealing with the political problems of getting things done.

This group indicated future goals of working in planning agencies, usually in smaller cities or metropolitan areas or a Model Cities administration. Many described their work as "within the structure," and where "your power was based on your effectiveness."

A smaller group expressed dissatisfaction with the program (but not to the point of withdrawing). Part of this group was concerned with

the other side of the coin that attracted the generalist group: they reacted against the "lack of substance" in the program, in terms of work in statistics and methods, research skills, and functional specialization areas. Often they found their substantive skills outside the program, in other departments like economics. They did respond positively to the recent introduction of new coursework in social planning research.

A more general criticism concerned the kind of assumptions underlying the program: the emphasis on what was termed "elitist-technocratic manipulation of people" by planners; the stress on means as opposed to ends; the lack of an explicit social change focus; the ignoring of questions of values and goals within the planning courses. They objected to the absence of any emphasis on self-presentation skills in the curriculum. The more critical in this group planned to leave the field and continue work in another area.

This second group were more vocal in their criticism of the role of students within the department. They felt that dissent was toned down by the use of faculty pressure and stipends, and by the tendency to create parallel committees of student and faculty. There was a great deal of agreement, by students both satisfied and dissatisfied with the program, on whether during the two years they became less activist. This was described most critically as being "put on a career ladder," oriented to successful planning jobs, bought off by stipends, and socialized to middle class roles and jobs. In the process of socialization, the internship appears to play an important role: most students returned from the summer work experience in planning agencies looking for more basic planning skills and less concerned--in their terms--about values and goals, or alternative roles in

planning. The funneling of diversity into a dominant professional model is reinforced by the lack of a diversified fieldwork component to the program (the ghetto courses have not yet been initiated), and what appears as a lack of support for those who are looking for alternatives to traditional professional practice. This reflects the faculty composition, which is candid about their biases and preferences, and in general the limited range of experience available to students.

To date no formal evaluation has been performed.

In a review of the first year of the program, the department wrote: "Thus, the two goals which were paramount in the original grant application--to train a 'new breed' of planner capable of applying planning concepts and tools directly to the solution of social problems, and to 'sensitize' a larger number of planners who will pursue more traditional career lines in urban and regional planning--were perceptibly advanced during the first year of the program." It also was indicated that "the faculty involved in the social policy planning program feel that significant strides were made, during the 1969-1970 year, in the development of theoretical and conceptual constructs regarding the nature and roles of social policy planning in the United States."[19]

While planners may have been sensitized by their exposure to social planning coursework, whether their behavior on the job -- given the programs and policies traditional agencies -- will in fact be more sensitive than traditionally trained planners is, at this time, moot. The placement data in Table XI does indicate that most graduates are in traditional planning slots, and not in the newer Model Cities or OEO programs. There is little in the way of evidence that new theoretical or conceptual constructs regarding the nature and roles of social policy

planning have been developed. In this sense, the claim to have trained a "new breed" of planner would appear to be over-stated: the program has been weak in providing substantive policy skills to participants, and graduates have gravitated to traditional agencies (this may be because of their own interests, a by-product of their training, or because there is no viable employment alternative at present).

4. Berkeley.

The Berkeley program was in many ways the most ambitious in its stated objectives, included in which would be training a new generation of academic and professional leaders, and developing a new educational structure in the department. The proposal stated,

> If we are successful, our graduates will be among the shapers of the social policies planning field, and the future of the field is still too vague to permit us to chart career lines. We can say with confidence only that the convergence of expectations among professionals engaged in a wide spectrum of activities does seem to signal a new convergence among the professions. If we are right, and if that convergence does furnish the basis for a new and positive approach to mental health and human development, career opportunities for our graduates will abound.
>
> We seem to share an image of the new academic style that we discussed in our prospectus. We are agreed that it must tap into the traditional scientific and humanitarian disciplines, but that it must simultaneously build upon the substantive knowledge that our individual professional schools can best teach. We are all determined to find ways of further eroding the institutional and conceptual boundaries that have demarcated our professional schools and academic departments and those that have too sharply distinguished instruction, research, and public service activities....we have been (taken) by the eagerness of the deans of the professional schools to suppress the autonomy of their own professions in favor of a common effort. They and we are holding out the hope that this program will evolve to become an inter-college degree program, rather than one that is localized in our department.[20]

It is too early, of course, to say what future lies in store for the program graduates. One has completed the program to date, and divides time between directing a research institute and teaching.

His other job choices at the time of graduation included work with a private development company and other teaching posts. A respectable showing, but not at all unusual for the graduates of a well-known department at a major university.

The assessment by faculty of students involved in the program is that they are good -- varied in background and previous experience -- and bright. Some argue that they are not the best, as a group, in the planning department.

While judgment is deferred on the future of graduates by the nature of things, there are some indications that the other major objective -- change in the educational structure, a new academic style, the withering away of boundaries -- remains as elusive as ever. Boundaries have not, in general, broken down within the planning department or the university as a whole, although individual students are crossing. Much of the Berkeley program's proposed evaluation was based on an epidemiological model: the diffusion of ideas from the program would change structures in other departments. There is no question that certain other departments have changed, reflecting more emphasis on interdisciplinary work and policy problems, but these appear as part of a general university-wide movement generated by pressures more pervasive than the model of the Department of City and Regional Planning.

A second aspect of the Berkeley objective, that the program evolve towards an inter-college degree program, is certainly not in evidence. Quite the opposite, more departments are developing parallel programs, based on their own traditions and professional perspective. Many of these overlap, students cross among them and draw on faculty in other areas, but each program preserves its measure of autonomy. The most

recent to develop is the Public Affairs program, referred to above. Quite apparently, it is not about to concede the field to city planning, or any other program, nor was some sort of merger with city planning ever held as a suitable alternative (although social policy students take courses from some Public Affairs faculty). In fact, one faculty member in the social policy program estimates that there are thirty-seven urban policy-related degree programs at Berkeley, and by loose count 1,400 to 1,600 courses which relate to urban affairs: and the proliferation continues. In any case, the direction of current events is towards increasing proliferation of programs, deans who are still very much concerned with preserving boundaries, and a widespread diffusion of similar objectives.

While the social planning program has not changed its external environment to any great extent, it has performed well on its own terms. It has built up a rich offering of courses, has attracted good students (in the faculty view), and required them to take courses outside the department. Similarly, it has attracted students from public affairs, public health, architecture, social welfare, etc., to social policy planning courses. The program has introduced a sequence in deliberate social change that, for a professional department, represents an important addition: the use of the self in social action, exploring self-awareness and a clinical approach to change. Of the programs considered, only Florida State and Berkeley have attempted work in this area, quite surprising in view of the way planners by necessity interact with other people in the course of their work.

On the other side, there are faculty members who suggest that "if we encourage people to raise questions of meaning and purpose, to be self-aware, as a standpoint from which to explore policy issues more sensitively, we also need to help them work back to a more pragmatic level of analysis. Questions of value and identity can ultimately only be resolved provisionally and privately, from a sense of the meaning of one's own experience; and, if the analysis of policy had to wait for answers to these questions, it would wait forever. So it seems important that self-awareness should not become stuck in an introverted preoccupation with personal values. Yet, at the same time, this awareness is needed for any sophisticated analysis."[21] The three-course sequence that explores this area of self-awareness and deliberate change has been very much a group experience, making the students in general close and tight knit. In assessing its impact, some faculty members argue that it has fostered a sensitivity to and awareness of value issues in policy that is not found in other planning specializations or programs. Some other faculty feel that the sequence has encouraged the development of an elitist group, with a smugness that damages relations with others in the department.

The students are varied in background and in research interests, which range over the police, public education, disability, public health, governmental reorganization, Model Cities, etc. For them, the program is a setting, a place of opportunities: they came looking for flexibility and support -- a "place where people are into things." All interviewed were enthusiastic about it.

Under the program, the students bear the burden of developing the new field of social policy and integrating the material that they gather when they cross traditional academic lines. It is the students who are expected to go out and get the pieces of problems--from economics, political science, public health, sociology, etc., and to re-conceptualize what they have garnered. The faculty are available as resources and sounding boards, as specialized sources in themselves, but they are not (necessarily) involved in the interdisciplinary work. A conflict arises, at least from the student view, because while the student goes out and is responsible for integrating new fields, the faculty remain as program administrators and, more importantly, judges of individual performance. Students were dissatisfied with how goals were set for the program and with their lack of participation in this. They found some of the faculty difficult to talk to about their work. And they resented the double messages: do what you want, on the one hand; and we are judging you, on the other. Most students felt that communication became more difficult after the first year of the program, when according to them, the faculty tended to become less interested in where the program was going in general. Many, however, felt that this would change as the new chairman became more active in the department.

The students interviewed emerged as a highly differentiated group. Unlike the student bodies at the three programs described above, they were all actively involved in outside field projects and

research projects, but in addition, were exploring new roles and new areas in a way which contrasted with other programs. At the same time, some faculty members felt that while the students were being exposed to a wide range of disciplines, they were not getting involved in enough depth to insure mastery -- that the exposure to other fields was superficial.

The ideal graduates, it was felt, would be "credible, aggressive, and recognizable," either in writing "great books" or guiding policy. They would appear to be credible -- eclectic, drawing on different methods, real problem oriented, and capable. There is some question, among faculty at least, whether they are aggressive -- "not afraid of policy"; at present, role expectations tend to be academic as opposed to action oriented. They are not yet recognizable as a group, simply because the social policy planning option at Berkeley is not yet a "way of thought" of a coherent, readily identifiable set of concepts and skills.

E. Evaluation

Comparing these programs with one another is like comparing apples and oranges: differences in objectives and approaches make inter-program comparisons difficult. Granting this, what kind of statements can be made about these four programs? Given the constraints of the short time the programs have operated and the difficulty in specifying inputs and outcomes in education, what kind of preliminary evaluation emerges?

For analytical purposes, two types of training programs are differentiated: instrumental and clinical. The divison is based on three related variables:

One, the basic assumptions concerning the nature of social policy (does it constitute a loosely bound field of interest or is it a discipline on its own terms? Is social policy planning a discipline, as some contend:

> Social administration as a subject is not a messy conglomeration of the technical ad hoc. It has been slowly conceptualizing its major fields of research and teaching....I happen to believe that as a subject social administration has begun to develop a body of knowledge and a related set of concepts and principles. It is in the process of knowledge building which is one of the attributes of science.[22]

or is it a field?)

> Social administration cannot be studied in isolation from major social sciences. Most of its body of knowledge could be incorporated in these disciplines.... it has scant theoretical structure. Its methods are dictated by the problem at hand and are not a 'discipline.' It is a 'field' -- the development of collective action for social welfare -- in which scholars drawn from the various disciplines try to clarify problems....Indeed, much of the best research in social administration goes on under other titles.[23]

Two, the style of teaching and learning that characterizes the program (does it stress a symmetrical, joint student-teacher learning process, or does it employ a more traditional, asymmetrical teacher to student transfer process?).

Three, the structure of the course of study (does the program place emphasis on the synthesis of a range of materials and disciplinary skills, or does it stress a set of core skills, methods, and applications?).

In terms of these variables, the instrumental type tends to assume that social policy planning incorporates a set of problems, methods, solutions, etc., that is both teachable (i.e. can be transferred from teacher to student in more or less traditional forms) and applicable to professional practice. Programs in this category tend to emphasize preparation for traditional professional planning roles, and to be relatively self-contained in terms of problems considered, methods and techniques, etc., and relatively constrained in the use of the university and the community. The clinical type, on the other hand, attempts to explore social policy as a problematical field of inquiry, stressing individual integration and synthesis of diverse material and inquiry, emphasizing innovations in teaching and learnings, and holding a pluralistic model of subsequent professional roles.

In the instrumental group would be Florida State, Puerto Rico, and North Carolina; Berkeley would be in the clinical category. (Among the non-NIMH supported programs discussed, M.I.T., at both Ph.D. and Master's levels, and Brandeis could be grouped with Berkeley, with the Master's level public policy programs more appropriately grouped with the instrumental group.

The emphasis in programs of the instrumental type is in developing and teaching applications and solutions to social policy planning. The orientation is to professional practice and training in a more traditional city planning sense. Programs tend to stress traditional teaching of a core of descriptive and prescriptive materials on planning agencies and programs, and methods of analysis and problem solution. In general, given the synthetic nature of the field, the integration of material relating to social policy issues is a faculty process. Characteristically, the emphasis is programmatic. Training models and anticipated professional roles tend to be more specific and less diverse than in the clinical programs.

In the clinical group, the assumption is (ideally, as we shall see) that the field of social policy planning is at present, "unteachable:" that it is a broad area of interest in which there is little that can be passed in the traditional sense from teacher to student that applies to the field as a whole, although specifics from relevant disciplinary or professional areas can be taught. In general, this position holds that it is up to individuals to integrate and to put together individual programs and insights; ideally, this can be facilitated by a joint faculty-student learning process, in which everyone is both a student and a resource.

Programs in the clinical category tend to be problematical in orientation. One objective is to provide a setting for the individual integration and synthesis of a range of disciplinary skills and interests with a variety of real-world experience. In this sense,

the clinical style implies internalization of the target system (welfare, education, drug abuse, rehabilitation, etc.) and identification with, empathy for, and understanding of the client/target, his system of values, and his view of the world, as a basis for policy or action. The learning model says that because the field is diverse, undeveloped, and oriented to problems, learning must be a joint student and teacher exploration. Role models tend to be multiple, and somewhat vague, reflecting individual blends of academic, professional, administrative, and change agent orientations. Programs in this category tend to reflect the ambiguity of the field as they see it, with its complexity in terms of issues of choice and conflict, and tend to be less "neat" in terms of ready descriptions of what the program is all about and what subsequent roles will involve.

The criteria for judging the performance of training programs based on these different assumptions must of necessity differ. In the case of the clinical type programs, the critical question is whether or not the structure of the program facilitates the process of joint learning, whether it enables individuals to break boundaries, whether it supports the search for synthesis. Problems associated with this approach include the difficulty in assessing quality, in ensuring scholarship in the absence of traditional guidelines, overcoming the weight of older, established roles, and deciding who judges whom and how programmatic goals are to be set.

For the instrumental program, the criteria involve the completeness of the training (are there gaps?), the ability of faculty to

convey the material, the existence of research as a basis for applied work and teaching, and the adequacy of the role conceptions used as training targets. The problem with this approach is that in those cases where the field does not exist as a discrete and bounded entity, the entire burden of integration and synthesis falls on the faculty. In the face of ambiguity, the tendency may be to revert to pre-existing professional identifications.

In this sense, the difficulty in mounting a truly effective training program in social policy planning is enormous. The field is not developed, there is no consensus as to its boundaries, its central puzzle is elusive. In short, many of the difficulties associated with the three programs in question here stem from the fact that social planning is not (yet?) a discipline.

In taking the instrumental group (Florida State, Puerto Rico, and the University of North Carolina) as a unit (rather than individually as a function of their stated objectives, as above), it is worth noting the constraining effect of time: in a two-year program, there are definite limits to the depth of study that is possible. In all these programs there is an attempt to teach a great deal -- the planning process, social structure, social policy issues and processes, and substantive work as well (housing, health, welfare, education, etc.). Somewhere, something has to be spread thin. In most cases, the first to be sacrificed is depth in a substantive area: there is not enough time for a four or five course sequence -- enough to provide mastery -- in a functional area like education, welfare, housing, etc.

Of these instrumental programs, none offers basic course work in the contextual areas of social policy: poverty, race, institutional analysis or social class analysis. This either comes in bits-and-pieces as part of other courses, or as part of an introductory course.

These substantive omissions reflect the professional origins of the faculties which are drawn primarily from city planning, with a minority from social welfare. The pattern of their education included exposure to a range of issues and disciplines plus a specialization in a particular area: economics, social research, planning theory, etc. The tendency then, is to develop applications of these specializations (e.g. survey research techniques in city planning, the economics of housing), but drawing on basic work being performed elsewhere. Thus, basic research on poverty or race is typically carried out by economists, sociologists, and political scientists rather than city planners.

There are other biases in faculty composition. There is in general a lack of policy experience: the outside experience of most faculty involved was in planning research or consultation, not administration or policy formulation. Administrative experience in line agencies is rare in these programs. So is experience in the executive branch of government, as mayor's staff analysts or policy advisors. At the same time, there is little collective experience in working with neighborhood and community groups, as advocate planners. There is a definite orientation away from work with small groups.

In the context of the instrumental programs, the dominant paradigm for explaining how things work is disjointed incrementalism (this will be examined in more detail in Section III, below). At issue here is

not the objective reality of this interpretation of decision making, but the virtual exclusion of alternative formulations in the teaching of these programs. The practical effect of this is to inhibit any student/faculty exploration of alternatives, either as interpretations of social problems, or as possible new roles for planners. Those students who through experience or inclination are outside the dominant model tend to be unsupported in these programs; there is no forum to facilitate the search for something different, and at the same time, little opportunity to participate in redefining goals, etc., relating to the program.

The "narrowness" is reinforced in other ways: inside the university, most program faculty admit the resources of the larger community are underutilized. Again, this is in large part a function of time. In schedules that include two sets of core requirements, there is relatively little opportunity to exercise choice from other departments. Pre-requisite requirements further inhibit moving out. Perhaps more basic is the high cost of information. It is often difficult to know about courses in other departments, both for faculty and students in a particular department. From interviews, it appears that the process is largely through word-of-mouth from fellow students, with a resultant clustering, and faddishness, that is not optimal.

Outside the university, fieldwork and outside projects are limited (although all programs were making efforts to improve performances in this area). While students universally regarded these as valuable, they did not receive credit for participation, if indeed placements were available.

In place of formal evaluation, these programs have relied on informal mechanisms. Quite simply these involved feedback from the market, and the channels for information are centralized around the department chairman. The criteria are some sort of informal equation of starting salaries, respectable placements, promotion. Interestingly, most programs also proposed these considerations as elements in their formal self-evaluations. In either case, the concern is more with the impact and impression of the program than with the process of learning and teaching.

The perceived emphasis on respectability is an important part of the process of socialization, which students described as being "put on a career ladder." Departmental models and student internship experiences were important factors in this process, which tended to reduce activism and supplant "idealism" with realism. The evidence for this is suggestive, but, for example, students interviewed in these programs were not involved in a search for new work roles (e.g. communal practice, consumer advocates) were not "counter culture" in life style, or politically radical. (These are proxy variables, to be sure, but nevertheless there is a definite contrast involved along just these lines between certain programs, e.g. Florida State and Berkeley.)

The interaction of these tendencies results in a serious deflection of objectives. All the programs start with the assumption that it is necessary to do more than deal with the delivery of the established social services. Exactly this point is often used to differentiate social policy planning programs from those originating in schools of social work -- social work schools, so the reasoning goes, are preoccupied with the delivery of social services, and oriented to

individuals, while city planning schools are concerned with the interaction between the environmental and social systems. Yet, despite this premise, and despite the best intentions of many of the faculty, the new effect of background, experiences and curriculum materials is to revert to a concentration on delivering social services. This is as true of the paradigmatic social planning programs -- Model Cities and OEO, which are invoked as the examples of applied social planning practice -- as it is of these particular training programs (see below, Section III.)

In summary, these programs are concerned ultimately with only a part of system subsumed under social policy, that part which deals with programming social services. In doing so, social planning is hard pressed in competition with specialists in various social service functional sectors (health, welfare, education, manpower), and, on another front, hard pressed by policy analysts, who claim that their quantitative tools are applicable to the whole range of policy areas with a bonus of political awareness thrown in as well.

The general categorization of this group of programs should not suggest that all three programs in the instrumental group are subject to these factors to the same degree. There is variation, as has been suggested in the sub-sections dealing with each program above, and on many of these points faculty are trying to improve program performance. Puerto Rico, with its societal concern and the awareness of dependency as a theme in social issues, is more "anti-establishment" oriented than Florida State or North

Carolina. North Carolina is developing increasing strength in methodology; Florida State is developing a nucleus around the behavioral sciences.

In the clinical approach -- the Berkeley program being the chief example -- the evaluative question is centered less on what is taught and more on what, and how, people are learning. As stated above, the assumptions of the Berkeley program -- emphasizing interdisciplinary work and joint student/faculty learning -- are consistent with the view of social policy as a developing, not developed, field. The actual performance of the Berkeley program, however, appears to fall short of achieving these (ambitious) goals. Similarly, the M.I.T. program, which has not stated these objectives in as explicit fashion as Berkeley and which has done less, in a formal administrative sense, to implement them, suffers many of Berkeley's same weaknesses. This suggests that the problems involved are formidable -- deriving from both the planning profession and the nature of large, contemporary universities.

The notion of learning which underlies the Berkeley program, and others sharing this approach, has two aspects: one, that both faculty and students share the commitment to joint learning; and two, that the program structure facilitates, and does not inhibit, individual efforts at pulling together pieces of the field and integrating them into something new.

During the first year of the program, a joint faculty student seminar examined, and attempted to define, the field of social policy; the experience, as recalled by students interviewed, was in general

frustrating, but did provide the basis for group cohesion and spirit. A subsequent seminar in education policy provided a substantive area in which a variety of individual skills was relevant, and was more satisfying. Newer students to the program, however, felt that the faculty dropped interest after the first year, and that since then the commitment to joint exploration has not been forthcoming. While communication on an individual basis with faculty members has developed to some degree (certain faculty members were considered more difficult to talk to than others), the group process by and large has been institutionalized around the series of courses taught by Leonard Duhl, a psychiatrist, on the use of the self in social change. Duhl has also served as the advisor to many social planning students. But while this has helped to maintain strong group feeling among certain social policy planning students, it is not the same as a collaborative faculty-student enterprise, centering as it does on a sub-group of students and a single faculty member.

Nor, from the student point of view, has the collaborative approach worked in courses or seminars that rely on traditional faculty-student relationships. It is not unusual, given the diverse background of the social policy students, for their experience when taken together to outweigh a faculty member's limited policy/outside experience by several times in years or range.

Rather, student group identification has been most effectively reinforced by the practice of preparing for exams together (a process which involves students mapping out a field, writing questions, and teaching each other).

Programatically, the faculty still determines what is and what is not acceptable. They give the exams, they pass students through the various gates, and they make the decisions regarding courses and advise students what to take. Students do not participate in shaping the goals of the program and are still subject to the overall view of the faculty that shapes the field.

The question at issue is whether the Berkeley program has gone far enough to insure that its objectives will be met. Thus, while there is agreement, in the social planning program, that students, not faculty, are responsible for pulling together the pieces of the emerging field, the freedom for the students to choose their own programs and design their own education is not apparent. From the student point of view, the structure of the program has not been opened up enough really to generate the great breakthroughs that were anticipated. The commitment to collaborative learning on the part of the faculty has not been sustained, and innovations which might facilitate this have not been introduced (opening up funds for student administered research, gaming and simulations involving both groups, vouchers good for study in a variety fo contexts, student-taught courses and workshops, etc.). On the positive side, students felt that there were individual faculty members that they could talk to, and that the presence of a new chairman would improve communication within the program.

The second objective -- achieving a truly interdisciplinary program -- has been frustrated by the intransigence of academic departments in general, the difficulties in achieving the necessary depth to establish mastery of outside fields, and the difficulty

in establishing credibility for interdisciplinary degrees. It should come as no surprise to anyone familiar with universities that these are difficult obstacles to surmount. The failure to make more progress towards these goals suggests that the means proposed were insufficient.

The case of the M.I.T. program is in many respects similar. It has described and set up the field as one which students are to form and integrate for themselves, suggested collaborative approaches to learning, and opened up the possibility of interdisciplinary learning. Achievement has been limited by many of the same factors that were discussed for the Berkeley program: faculty-student collaborative efforts have not materialized, even to the extent of the Berkeley program; interdisciplinary efforts are institutionalized in joint degree programs with economics or with political science, and while successful, represent something less than the broader objectives of the Berkeley program; and interviews suggest that the fragmentation of the department and a persistent anomie makes student-faculty communication far more difficult than in the Berkeley case (see July 1970, AIP for an extended discussion of this).

In general, then, the Berkeley program is more open than most departments, but the innovations introduced to date as part of the social planning program are not sufficient to break through to a new critical mass -- the achievement of a new academic style.

Taking these programs together, is it possible to derive performance standards for this new academic style? On the basis

of the programs this paper considers, there are some suggestions that can be made. Five components (the disciplinary mix, students, faculty, research, and fieldwork) appear to be critical in designing a model educational structure and process for teaching and learning in an eclectic, developing field like social policy. Together, these constitute performance standards for an interdisciplinary, policy-oriented program. This is not to suggest that the entire range of issues involved in relating educational objectives to program design is exhausted by these five factors, but only to underline those selected factors which appear most important in relation to the social policy planning programs covered in this study.

In looking at the performance of these programs, it becomes clearer that the institutional and traditional obstacles to innovation related to these five factors are manifold. The problems in mounting social policy planning programs of this kind within the university setting -- with disciplinary autonomy, departmental organization, and a complex system of rewards -- should not be understated. As representatives of specific cases within a more general and widespread effort to introduce innovative programs in universities, the performance of the programs under consideration in this study must be seen in the context of these constraints to be fairly understood. Evaluation of these cases suggests that unless adequate means (resources, social and institutional inventions, commitments, etc.) are proposed and can be commanded by program developers, innovative program objectives are not likely to be achieved.

1. The disciplinary mix: The critical issue in formulating educational objectives for an extensive field like social policy would appear to be the tension between adequately covering the number of sub-areas involved while maintaining a level of research and analysis sufficient to insure a quality of scholarship that allows the acquisition of substantive skills.

As an umbrella concept, social policy covers an extensive area:[24]

-- the analysis of policy formulation and its intended and unintended consequences;

-- the study of social needs, how they are defined, how they change over time, how they relate to existing and proposed interventions, and the study of social problems, variously defined, like race, poverty;

-- the study of social services, transactions, and transfers, problems of access to and utilization of these, patterns of geographic location, their distribution and the outcomes or consequences of those services, etc.;

-- the study of the structure, function, organization and administrative processes of institutions and agencies;

-- the study of distributive and allocative patterns in the command of resources and the impact of social services, transactions and transfers on these patterns;

-- the study of the roles and functions of professionals, elected officials, and administrators in the operation of social welfare agencies and institutions;

-- the study of the nature and distribution of social costs and benefits;

-- the study of the social rights of citizens as users and participants in social services and social programs;

-- the study of the role of government at all levels in defining rights to social property through social and administrative law;

-- the development of methods of planning, policy analysis and evaluation, decision making, etc., appropriate to social policy; and

-- the study of social change.

A program that attempts to deal adequately with this range of issues is immediately involved in a number of disciplinary areas; social policy becomes a "supradiscipline....based on behavioral sciences and analytical approaches, relying also on decision theory, general systems theory, management sciences, conflict theory, strategic analysis, systems engineering, and similar modern areas of study.... at the same time, it must accept tacit knowledge and experience as important sources of knowledge, in addition to more conventional methods of research and study....as well as deal with the contributions of systematic knowledge and structured rationality to human and social conscious self-direction. But in addition it must clearly recognize the important roles of both extra-rational processes and/or irrational processes...."[25] Policy studies must draw on descriptive and prescriptive components taken from economics, political science, sociology, social psychology and psychology, organization theory, management sciences, operations research and, some would add, history and philosophy.

In addition, "a multiplicity of learning methods is required. These methods -- in addition to more traditional lectures, readings, exercises, colloquia, and seminars -- have to include, as a minimum: gaming, cases and projects, internship, new type of dissertations, and study tours. Also, some experimentation with task directed T-group methods is indicated."[26]

Given the extent of the curriculum and the variety of roles involved, one observer has noted:

> Although one must be wary of unrealistic, 'Leonardesque' aspirations which diffuse competence and create the risk of 'dilletantish' skimming, the policy scientist must bear some of the same marks of the disciplined generalist. That is, he must be able to view problems from multiple perspectives, he must have broad search patterns, and must have a comprehensive framework which enables him to consider the strengths and weaknesses of various analytic schemes relative to different sorts of problems.[27]

The pressure to include so much material, and in so many ways, tends to force these programs to the Ph.D. level where students have already acquired a disciplinary base and where program flexibility allows them time to acquire new skills in depth and ample scope to integrate learning, research, and applications.[28]

2. Students. Students, of course, are expected to be of high calibre, preferably with some kind of outside experience -- work in a complex organization, Peace Corps, political or community organization, etc. One observer notes that "short internship programs during academic studies are no substitute for this requirement, being too artificial and too protected to serve as a useful surrogate for real work experience."[29]

Obviously, the desired heterogeneity of students enrolled in programs of this type may itself create problems, as in the need to deal at one and the same time with students of widely different levels of preparation in basic skills, e.g., mathematics.

A related problem concerns the relative backgrounds of students with undergraduate engineering-science majors and those with social science humanities majors. "In many respects, the educational task of the public policy unit is to extend the perspectives of each group to that of the other: to teach people with analytic backgrounds to adapt their skills to a public policy problem environment and to infuse those with the generally less rigorous social science background with some intellectual toughness in the form of systematic modes of thought and analysis."[31]

3. Faculty. The requirements for faculty are even more demanding:

> The innovative nature of the proposed program constitutes a great challenge to the faculty and imposes on it a significant burden. It is up to the faculty to build up a new discipline while teaching it; this requires not only the qualities of all high-grade academic work but involves also capacities to stand alienation from the traditional disciplines and to accept negative reactions from the traditional peer groups.[32]

Collectively, they must represent a variety of disciplines; individually, they must be able to stand the ambiguity of working in a developing field and, importantly, they must be able to work closely with students. At least some of them must have extensive experience in applied policy analysis.

4. Research: Strong research components are considered necessary to insure a supply of relevant teaching materials, "maintenance of close contact with policy realities and development

of knowledge through applied research in policy analysis, reorganization of policy-making units, social experimentation, and similar policy advisory and policy-making improvement activities."[33]

5. Fieldwork: This provides students with experience in real and realistic policy applications and is considered "critical for integration of knowledge, for development of capacities, to apply knowledge to concrete policy problems, and for conveying tacit knowledge and skills."[34]

Even in a setting where these elements can be molded together in a cohesive organizational form, it seems likely that student-faculty relations will continue to pose difficulties. The Berkeley program, for example, started with a commitment to joint student-faculty collaborative learning, arguing that this form was appropriate to the emerging field. The relationship has proven difficult to maintain, and in student perceptions at least, has broken down. Part of this difficulty seems inherent, for while faculty remain, student populations turn over yearly; collaborative work, for faculty members, may thus involve considerable redundancy. Considerations of status and relative position in the university community are also involved; and there are few existing models on which faculty or students can draw.

In any case, the pressure for joint student-faculty work, and increased student demands for participation in developing and managing the program is real and likely to persist. From the student perspective, their collective experience, in terms of years or range of policy activities, may well outweigh that of many faculty members.

Of course, opinions will vary widely on the extent of appropriate student roles. With respect to public policy programs, Dror, for example, has warned that students may be motivated" to try and 'soften' the program....and that the essentially intellectual, clinical and 'policy oriented' approach may result in adverse reactions by students who may prefer 'action' to analysis and try to move the program into 'change agent' directions....the faculty must maintain sufficient control over the program to bring the students to more advanced states.... student participation should be encouraged and student influence welcomed, but without being permitted to determine the basic features and orientations of the program."[35]

Others argue that, especially in the context of programs like social policy planning at Berkeley, where the burden of interdisciplinary synthesis is placed on the students, students should have far greater autonomy to teach themselves, to design their programs, to initiate joint research projects and learning settings. Various institutional arrangements might facilitate this, including student administered research funds (as at M.I.T.) increased control over program development, provision of funds or vouchers (perhaps good at other universities), gaming situations, etc. The critical dimensions will be insuring quality of scholarship, and from faculty point of view, faculty autonomy.

Nor do these considerations of content, interdisciplinary relations, and joint exploration of new teaching methods exhaust the list of problems inherent in teaching social policy. Dror, in summarizing a series of papers on the subject, notes in addition to many of the issues mentioned above, the following dilemmas:

-- elite programs versus minority advancement;

-- academic orientation versus action and 'change agent' orientation;

-- preparation for novel professional staff positions versus preparation for existing senior policy-making line position, both in political and in civil service;

-- lack of attention to the relationship between policy research and policy sciences teaching -- perhaps because of the difficulties of building up significant policy research activities at universities and the absence of frank confrontation of value issues involved in the teaching of policy sciences.[36]

The social policy planning programs in this study appear relatively weak when viewed as efforts to develop interdisciplinary and innovational learning programs in the university setting. The programs do not include anything near the suggested range of disciplines. Nor can they be characterized as interdisciplinary, in the sense of related disciplines grouped under a higher organizing principle or construct and at best sharing a common axiomatics; they represent a narrow variety of disciplines presented simultaneously, but without making explicit the interrelationships among them. They rely almost entirely on traditional teaching methods, and the fieldwork and research components in applied social policy analysis in most programs are not of adequate depth.

It has been argued that "in establishing and maintaining an interdisciplinary unit, in a disciplinary structured university... the environmental determinant of long-run viability is a structure of supportive relationships with disciplinary units."[37]

The programs under study did not, in most cases, display strong supportive relationships with other departments and programs. It is easy to get the impression that, from the perspective of other departmental units, social planning curricula represent watered-down material from other disciplines, that their students are judged according to lower standards, and that their faculties (with individual exceptions) do not represent research or scholarship of the first rank.

Part of this may reflect the traditional objections leveled at interdepartmental efforts, area studies, and synthetic programs, etc.; much of it, however, appears justified in view of the evaluation presented above. The crucial point here is that whatever the objective basis for the attitudes involved, the end result is that supportive relationships with disciplinary units are noticeably weak.

What does this evaluation mean from the perspective of the funding agency -- the Center for Studies of Metropolitan Problems at the National Institute of Mental Health?

It would be easier to answer this question if there were a clear sense of what NIMH intended to get for its money. Whatever the objectives may have been at a given time, they are now somewhat obscured by changes in the administrative directions of the funding branch (four different Metro Center chiefs over the period of these grants), and by some confusion as to what exactly the grant proposals intended. In any case, several goals are evident: to support innovation in the planning specialties, overcoming fragmentation, compartmentalization, and narrow professionalism; to encourage the introduction of positive mental health components into planning specialties; and, "if NIMH has

any purpose in the social policies and planning areas, it is to advance the field by adding new knowledge, and not to crank out practitioners."[38]

Did support of these programs lead to innovation in planning practice, the development of new professional roles, or new knowledge? Only a qualified answer can presently be given. The role of the Metro Center appears to have been supportive of a set of efforts to broaden planning education to include more work relevant to social policy. Metro Center support has not introduced major innovations in planning education or effected significant changes in the state of knowledge concerning social policy questions.

Within planning education, this support has not, so far, generated sufficient momentum to create the new kind of education that was talked about in the grant proposals. Instead the funded projects supported interested faculty members and helped departments move somewhat beyond the confines of traditional planning education. In the larger context of city planning practice, hopes for major innovational impacts appear. However, the introduction of some 75 "new breed" social planners into the profession on a yearly basis could hardly have this kind of effect: New Planners have to work up the departmental hierarchies and prove their effectiveness; in some cases they are shunted into social service planning roles that are peripheral to the major programs being funded within agencies. (According to an American Institute of Planners 1969 survey, less than 4 percent of the membership reported themselves as concentrating in "social planning." By way of contrast, 75 percent reported themselves in "administration for planning

and development," or "comprehensive physical planning.")

Several factors suggest that the Metro Center role in terms of these social policy planning programs was to support on-going (and important) reforms in planning education, but not to generate or advance new knowledge or roles.

Many significant changes in planning practice preceded the funding of these programs. The reaction against urban renewal and physical planning had been effected by the time these programs were developed, at least so far as planning education was concerned. Model Cities and OEO programs were underway, attempting some form to implement the socially-oriented, comprehensive style of planning that lies at the heart of these programs (the bounded ones at least). The disappointing performance of OEO and Model Cities programs, in addition, is typically considered political -- the problem was not the availability of planning professionals with social planning majors, but Congressional politics, competing Federal agencies, and ineffective local government. What is more, much of planning practice today is thought to continue to abuse the principles of good social planning, despite the presence of trained social planners; once again, the problem is not seen as the lack of trained manpower.

Two, there is no evidence that new social planning roles are emerging in response to these programs or in response to demand forces in general. Concurrently, Model Cities and OEO programs are being cut back, many neighborhoods and communities want to do their own planning, and city planning employment is being cut back.

Three, the development of new knowledge is not much in evidence. The discussion above of the Berkeley program suggests some

of the problems involved in innovation in this area.

Four, similar developments in these areas -- planning roles, new knowledge, educational innovation, policy emphasis -- to the extent that they have materialized, have also appeared in programs which have not enjoyed NIMH support. The concern for social values, for preparing "socially sensitive planners," for developing tools and techniques for policy analysis and formulation, surfaced in many city planning programs and in university departments in general. No single program or funding agency -- public or private -- can really claim credit for a set of ideas which are so widely diffused.

The harshness of these answers can be tempered: if Metro Center support did not generate these new developments, the funding did allow programs to bring new faculty into the field, to support students, to begin to introduce more effective fieldwork projects, and to introduce new course offerings in the social policy field. Given the pressures, much of this would have happened anyway, but the effect is, in every case, positive, if incomplete.

Did NIMH support lead to new educational patterns, specifically new interdisciplinary learning styles appropriate to the field of social policy? In the case of the three instrumental programs, I argue that it did not: their concern with training professionals has meant reliance on traditional forms and patterns. In the case of the Berkeley program, a start was made; but, in the analysis presented here, the means were inadequate to the task.

It is safe to say that none of these programs has fulfilled the real potential of the field. The evidence suggests that the field at best defines areas of interest and urgency. In terms of established skills and methods readily applicable to practicing planners, the field is undeveloped; roles or job opportunities, as presently conceived in these programs, do not appear promising. The potential of the field is bounded by the need for new knowledge and understanding about how policy decisions are made regarding social issues, and in this sense the field appears promising for further work. The promise of future exploration will involve innovation; however, (and again) the Berkeley program should serve as an indication of some of the difficulties faced in this task.

From the point of view of the funding agency -- the Metro Center in this case -- it is the agency itself which must bear the burden, in reviewing applications, of assessing the adequacy of the means proposed to meet the ends desired. If, as in this case, the goal is innovation in developing new knowledge in an emerging, multidisciplinary field like social policy, it is up to the agency to see that program directors recognize and can marshall resources sufficient to deal with the institutional obstacles which may inhibit successful performance. In the most practical terms, this means insisting that applicants state clearly their objectives, and more important, specify in detail how these can be met within the constraints of the resources and personnel under the control of the program.

FOOTNOTES -- SECTION II

1. There are some sixty graduate schools of city and regional planning. A complete list is available in the Journal of the American Institute of Planners, July 1970, p. 232. Schools of public policy/policy science, while newer, are growing in number. Included are the following: Program in Policy Sciences at State University of New York at Buffalo; the Graduate School of Public Affairs at University of California at Berkeley; School of Development Policies at University of Hawaii; Institute of Public Policy Studies at University of Michigan; School of Urban and Public Affairs at Carnegie-Mellon University; Program in Public Policy Analysis . the Fels Institute of Local and State Government at the University of Pennsylvania; Public Policy Program at John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University, among others.

2. Florida State University, Department of Urban and Regional Planning, Application for Training Grant, #MH11193-01A1. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. National Institute of Mental Health, Center for Studies of Metropolitan Problems, 2/1/68, pp. 2-50. Additional quotes drawn from Florida State University Department of Urban and Regional Planning Program Catalog (Tallahassee: Florida State University, 1970).

3. Ibid, p. 20.

4. University of Puerto Rico Department of Plannning Application for Training Grant, #MH12154-01A1. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. National Institute of Mental Health, Center for Studies of Metropolitan Problems, 8/27/69, pp. 16-40.

5. Janet S. Reiner, "Social Aspects of Housing and Urban Development and Social Policy," for Center for Housing, Building, and Planning, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, United Nations, (New York: August, 1970), p. 1.

6. University of North Carolina, Department of City and Regional Planning, Application for Training Grant, #MH11832-01. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. National Institute of Mental Health, Center for Studies of Metropolitan Problems. 6/10/68, p. 2.

7. Ibid., p. 32.

8. Ibid., pp. 32-33.

9. University of California at Berkeley, Department of City and Regional Planning, Application for Training Grant #MH10823-01. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. National Institute of Mental Health, Center for Studies of Metropolitan Problems. 8/1/66.

10. Peter Marris. Memo to Social Policies Planning Faculty, Berkeley, Undated, p. 2.

11. Ibid., pp. 10-11.

12. Ibid., p. 15.

13. Florida State University Department of Urban and Regional Planning, Catalog. (Tallahassee: Florida State University, 1970).

14. Berkeley Application, op. cit., p. 68.

15. North Carolina Application, op. cit., p. 68.

16. Florida State Application, op. cit., p. 52.

17. Puerto Rico Application, op. cit., p. 57.

18. North Carolina Application, op. cit., p. 73.

19. Department of City and Regional Planning, University of North Carolina. Annual Report attached to #MH11832-01. 1970-1971. p. 10.

20. Berkeley Application, op. cit., pp. 56-59.

21. Marris, op. cit., p. 2.

22. R. Titmuss, COMMITMENT TO WELFARE (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1968), p. 22-23.

23. D. V. Donnison, "The Evolution of Social Administration," NEW SOCIETY (October 20, 1966), p. 610.

24. Titmuss, op. cit., p. 46; also M. Rein, SOCIAL POLICY: ISSUES IN CHOICE AND CHANGE (New York: Random House, 1970), Chapter I; M. Brooks and M. Stegman, "Urban Social Policy, Race, and the Education of Planners," JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF PLANNERS (JAIP), XXXIV, No. 5 (Sept. 1968), pp. 284-85.

25. Y. Dror, "The Teaching of Policy Sciences," SOCIAL SCIENCE INFORMATION, IX, No. 2 (April 1970), p. 102-03.

26. Ibid., p. 108.

27. D. Bunker, "A Doctoral Program in the Policy Sciences," POLICY SCIENCES, V. 2, No. 1 (March 1971), p. 39.

28. Dror, op. cit., p. 104.

29. Ibid., p. 104.

30. J. Crecine, "University Centers for the Study of Public Policy," POLICY SCIENCES, V. 2, No. 1 (1971), p. 31.

31. Ibid., p. 29.

32. Dror, op. cit., p. 114.

33. Ibid., p. 117.

34. Ibid., p. 113.

35. Dror, op. cit., p. 117.

36. Dror, "Universities and the Teaching of Policy Sciences," POLICY SCIENCES, V. 2; (1971), p. 83-84.

37. Crecine, op. cit., p. 22.

38. Center for the Studies of Metropolitan Problems, National Institute of Mental Health. "Fiscal Year 1972 Budget Statement," draft.

III. SOCIAL POLICY PLANNING IN CONTEXT

A. Introduction

The intention up to this point has been to present an assessment of four social policy planning programs within the framework of their own stated goals and objectives. The evaluative section which concluded Part II suggested that, in a variety of ways, programs did not meet all their objectives, some of which included creation of a new style of teaching and learning relevant to social policy, the development of new methods of analysis, and training for new professional roles.

Part III attempts to place these training programs in a perspective that moves beyond the framework of stated objectives, challenging assumptions on which these goals are based and questioning the social services delivery focus inherent in most programs. It is argued that the reliance on incrementalism and a mode of working within the context of current government programs are elements in a pattern of thought that treats the social system as basically benevolent and holds that social problems can be cured by way of rational analysis and technical efficiency. The programs have not served as a forum for the exploration of alternatives in teaching and research, or for the development of alternative diagnostic paridigms or theories of social structure. The status quo orientation of the programs in the most basic areas of social structure and poverty analysis may account for the lack of innovation found in program performance in thinking and teaching about

social problems. Programs that could serve as a forum for the exploration of a variety of alternatives appear, from this perspective, as narrow and restrictive.

B. City Planning and the Development of Social Policy Planning

Social policy planning emerged as a movement within the city planning profession; the contours of social planning were shaped in major ways by the existing concerns and assumptions of the profession. On the evidence of the programs presented here, the continuing effect of the traditional profession has been to inhibit development of social policy capabilities of more general relevance.

The argument of this section is that many of the weaknesses in the performance of individual programs discussed in this paper can be traced back to the professional traditions of city planning. Included in this would be the research interests of the faculties involved and the nature of their outside experience, the difficulties in developing or adapting methodologies for social planning, the lack of substantive depth, the concentration on existing planning roles as models, and the need for much more teaching and research concerned with the historical and structural context of policy -- an historical view of social legislation, a perspective on social change and social welfare in a comparative framework.

The inhibiting effect of the past appears most powerful in two critical areas: the persistence of the comprehensive planning ideal, and the failure to move beyond a professional, manipulative

value orientation.

1. The efforts to establish the legitimacy of the new social planning movement focused on the continued identification with the comprehensive rational planning model.

Traditional city planning has always relied on a belief in the efficacy of a comprehensive and rational planning process which functions to convert "value choices into concrete programs and plans for action by choosing among alternative patterns and levels of allocating resources to reach some predefined goal."[1] The basic mechanism of the planning process* relates alternative means to the attainment of stated ends. Ideally, rational planning means consideration of all the alternative actions possible to the actor, identification of all the probable consequences which would flow from the adoption of each alternative, and selection of the most desirable alternative in terms of the given ends. A planning model of this type is implicitly (and on occasion explicitly) the basis for planning practice and education i.e. planners frequently use this kind of construct to describe their activities or to

---

*In practice, the rationality of this model is compromised. Ends are not always given in a clear and operational fashion: they tend to be general, sometimes trivial, objectives, and frequently conflict with each other. The interpretation of general goals is often distorted by the values -- implicit or explicit -- of the planner. The search for alternatives never considers "all" possibilities: "satisfying" solutions replace the search for optimum solutions. And finally, a given action has both anticipated and unanticipated consequences and these, of course, are never fully known beforehand.

discuss deviations from the indicated activities. In short, these models are important because planners tend to see themselves in these terms.

Thus, the North Carolina program proposal states:

> ....it has become increasingly evident that the planning process, as employed by professional planners, is as applicable to social problem-solving as it is to the solving of physical problems.[2]

Proposals or interviews from the other programs confirm this general confidence in the existence and applicability of a set of methods planners alone are able to employ. This hope is consistent with much of the early writing concerning "comprehensive social planing." Social policy, in this view, consists of a variety of situations that, in a kind of challenge-response pattern, call for solution: new technologies create new problems, new goals are developed, existing programs must be redefined or reformed, or new target populations require new programs. Solutions demand consideration of all relevant factors; consideration of problems in totality means consideration of social factors. The result was to be a "new comprehensiveness" linking physical planning with a human resources counterpart,

---

* (cont) The planning process is usually modeled as a series of stages. The first stage is seen as "planning instigators" -- problems that require solutions. The second stage is the "definition of need and planning task," in which the system bounding the problem to be solved is defined, resources are surveyed, the role of special interests evaluated, and the critical analysis of facts and values takes place. "Formulation of policy" represents a third stage in which the level of intervention, the specific goals of intervention, and the appropriate actions are indicated. A fourth stage is "programming," indicating specific actions, objectives, and costing out alternatives. A fifth stage includes "evaluation, monitoring, and feedback," in which the results of intervention are related to their intentions and programatic elements are revised accordingly.

expanding the scope to include economic assistance, discrimination, job policies, and social services.[3]

There was widespread agreement among participants in the programs that the attempt to graft social policy onto the comprehensive planning model had been unsuccessful and unproductive. The rational planning model failed to approximate the reality of the social planning process in several critical ways. First of all, the model suggests that the planning process follows an orderly time sequence, where first steps are completed and serve as inputs to subsequent stages. Case studies suggest that the process is more likely to be simultaneous than sequential -- goals are developed along with programs, planning tasks are defined in the process of programming. Secondly, the model implies that the planning activity is unitary, as if a single actor were performing all functions. In practice, planning is spread over several administrative divisions and frequently over several levels of government. Thirdly, planning takes place within the context of organizational behavior. It is subject to the effects of hierarchy, conflicting loyalties, and individual discretion. At the same time, the planning agency operates in an external environment; it must maintain itself, compete for resources, satisfy the expectations of its constituencies, and deal with the existing vested political interests. Finally, the model distorts the crucial role of interpretation and choice. Problems do not "appear" for solution independent of other factors but instead represent complex processes of identification and consideration of

questions of feasibility, self-maintenance, aggrandizement, and political capital. The interpretation of problems is not independent of a calculation of possible solutions. Nor is planning simply a choice of appropriate programs to suit given objectives, because goals frequently conflict. Most social problems do not have unique solutions: "....the most important issues in social policy concern its social purposes and hence there are no final solutions which enable men to choose among social aims, all of which are desirable and most of which conflict."[4]

In the training programs under study, the "new comprehensiveness" had not been achieved. Indeed it seemed to me to have been the wrong model for effective change. Emphasis might have been better placed on planning and policies for single services and limited purpose programs. The new comprehensiveness had led to a kind of superficial treatment of the diverse sectors and substantive areas which are involved in the notion of social policy, a repetition of the generalist bias in planning education.

In reaction to the weakness of the comprehensive model, some schools are stressing a return to "sectoral competence" -- the substantive sectors of housing, health, education, manpower, etc., which are receiving increasing attention in the instrumental programs of this sample. It is as if the profession were issuing a sigh of relief and settling down to those areas it knew best all along. M.I.T., for example, is strengthening its courses on housing development and has added a series of short courses on nuts-and-bolts planning.

There is a kind of irony in this about-face. One of the animating concerns in the applications for the social planning programs funded by NIMH is that discrete functional specializations--professions and administrative units--were unworkable and unsuited to the nature of social problems. Now, in reaction to the (often justified) ambiguity of social planning as it was introduced (i.e. uncertain boundaries and processes), the trend is to return to sectoral competence--which turns out to be something similar to what planners have always done. Supporters justify this by arguing that substantive depth is necessary, and that only those who master a substantive field have any sense of political feasibility. The danger, of course, is that the new specialists will rapidly become locked into their particular perspective, into a view of what "ought to be" in terms of their own administrative programs. It implies a return to emphasis on traditional roles, and away from the policy analyst positions that initially appeared so attractive. In other words, the shift is away from preparing, say, a mayor's urban policy advisor--an assistant conversant with a number of policy areas and some ability and tools to make judgments as to priorities among substantive areas, e.g. limited resources should go to health care and not housing at this time--to preparing a housing analyst, able to deal with housing problems, but not trained to deal with housing vis-a-vis other policy areas; away from an analytical capability and methodology in principle applicable to any policy situation or context, and towards concentration on specialized sectors.

2. Social policy planning did not resolve the issues of professional values and rapport with client populations, which stimulated the initial movement to establish a planning capability with greater sensitivity to social problems and the needs of people.

Initially, the introduction of social planning into city planning education represented an exhortation to planners to pay more attention to the effect of their policies on low income people and to the distribution of costs and benefits in planned interventions. These concerns found expression in the examination of the impact of middle-class values on professional planning practice and the consequent difficulties in achieving rapport with low-income, working class, or ethnic clients or "planned-for" groups. This concern was stimulated most pointedly in Gans' The Urban Villagers, which described the social impact of urban renewal on a poor and ethnic population. Gans wrote that:

> Planners and caretakers provide services based on middle class values... These professions work with a distorted picture of the class structure, for they generally distinguished only between a middle and a lower class...including within it both the working and lower class...they assume that this combined lower class is basically a frustrated version of the middle class, and that it exists only because lower class clients cannot gain access to the opportunities and services available to the middle class.[5]

Gans argues that the imposition of middle class values associated with professionalism was often based on ignorance of other class life styles and values, and was sometimes based on deliberate, ideological judgments. This imposition led to serious distortions in policy formulation, the denial of services to those in need, and perhaps most serious, the humiliation or threat of humiliation of clients from different backgrounds.

> In order to achieve any success in aiding lower class clients, planners and caretakers must be able to achieve rapport with them...They must establish a professional client relationship that is based on respect for the client, and that neither manipulates, patronizes, nor blames him for a condition for which he is not responsible.
>
> The development of a democratic form of rapport...will consequently require changes in the entire institutional complex of the planning and caretaking professions...It demands that dedicated and hardworking middle class people give up methods and symbols internalized through years of training and practice, and exchange them for new approaches catering to a strange and hostile culture, and to suspicious, deprived

> people...Some changes can be made, however, by reducing the emphasis on middle-class values in professional training, and by acquainting the professions with the problems and cultural patterns of the lower class as these are unearthed by social science research.[6]

While these observations might appear somewhat dated today and to retain an element of paternalism, their impact on the planning profession in the early 1960's was powerful.

Advocacy planning represented a major operational attempt of planners to deal with concerns of the kind expressed by Gans. It attempted to plan in conjunction with community groups, supplying technical expertise and organizational skills which would assist them in preparing alternatives to, or blocking, plans directed down from city planning agencies, highway departments, etc. Advocacy as a planning style was something less than satisfactory: it involved major problems of expert-layman relations and representation within communities; it often supported questionable ends, stimulating local groups towards objectives that could not be achieved; was biased towards participation of property owners; and in many ways reinforced the existing planning establishment. Yet despite its limitations, it did represent a re-orientation within the planning profession. Advocacy planning opened up many more opportunities for planners to work in non-traditional roles; and, whatever its failure, it did serve to give some planners and planning students an opportunity to gain a new kind of experience.

Interestingly, advocacy planning appears to have played virtually no part in any of the social policy planning programs among the NIMH-supported projects in this sample. Of the city planning programs, only M.I.T. has an active advocacy field program for its students, as well as some faculty with experience in this role. The other programs, with the exception of Puerto Rico, which was in the process of developing some advocacy field

projects, did not have this as a developed interest, although, in each department more "traditional" urban planning specializations often did deal with advocacy styles in both teaching and practice. Faculty in the social planning programs did not have advocacy experience. Rather than an orientation to small groups, which advocacy implies, the dominant model was oriented to "effective" operation within large (planning) organizations. Social planning, in other words, was seen as the activity of professionals and administrators, a management or analytical problem-solving activity performed in an atmosphere remote from considerations of rapport and direct interaction with consumers or target populations.

The lack of the concern for rapport, and the example of advocacy planning, underscore what may be termed, harshly perhaps, the elitism of social policy planning. On a surface level, these programs represent an elite in the way that any graduate educational program at the professional level does: a small, highly selected group enjoying high status and privilege. This is intensified, in some of these programs, by dividing the department into social planners versus the others, a trend most in evidence at Berkeley where the social planners constituted a self-styled elite, a self-image reinforced by the T-group process of the social change courses and their separation from the rest of the department (at least in the perception of faculty and some students outside the program).

But this kind of structural elitism is, I suggest, less consequential than the elitism reserved in the most basic assumptions and decision-making styles of social policy planning as it appears in these programs. Thus, although it starts with a stated commitment to social--i.e. peoples'--problems, the mode in which this commitment is viewed, enacted, and institutionalized is asymmetrical. The mode is, quite simply, that social

planners tell you what your problem is, they interpret it, and devise solutions accordingly. It represents an imposition from "the top" with the analysis and decision making centered in the hands of social planners who, by training at least, have had limited experience outside the relatively narrow confines of the department and its view of society and its priorities. The problem is that the training of planning professionals--like that of professionals generally--is inappropriately based on the medical model. The client, in the case of the social planner, often has his own ideas as to what is wrong and what appropriate responses might be and these may involve more basic changes in institutions or organizations than planners are able or willing to undertake.

One consequence of this training is that social planners do not learn to listen. They are trained to make their own interpretations and to develop solutions based on their analytical framework. The curricula of the programs tend to exclude the notion of listening; Puerto Rico has done the most to develop or apply methods--client analysis, participant observation--which might allow people to speak <u>through</u> the professional, but these are only a beginning, and not yet a major thrust of their program.

Three points are at issue here. The training of social planners does not provide them with the tools of "good listening" or observation, meaning the ability to collect and analyze in a manner as bias-free as possible of what people "out there" do and think. Ideally these tools would include participant observation, social survey techniques, ethnographic skills, community studies, <u>overlaid on a value orientation that recognized the importance and validity of the kind of information that would be obtained</u>.

Second, while most curricula do include some material regarding citizen participation in planning, these appear to me very limited in scope. For

one, the origins of participation in planning were in co-optation (in Selznick's sense), through citizen boards, presentations to neighborhood associations, etc. Even now, it usually means consultation with local people, but with the professionals retaining the right to interpret ("what you are really saying is...") and make final judgments. The terms of participation and the nature of the stakes are considered legitimate as given, despite challenges from minority groups, communities, etc. And, again, training does not include anything that would effect the basic value orientation of the planner to accept alternative forms of participation as legitimate or to explore what these might be.

Third, the relatively narrow range of field experiences in these training programs would appear to keep the social planner at a distance and away from exposure to other perspectives that might aid him in developing sensitivity to people's own preferences and an ability to implement social programs non-manipulatively. The training programs are insulated in the internal composition of both faculty and student bodies, with the most improvement to date being in the diversification of student enrollments--surely only a small beginning. These programs afford only limited opportunities for minority student participation. Even thougn most departments have made efforts to attract them, black students appear somewhat under represented in social planning programs. Interviews with black students at North Carolina, Florida State, and M.I.T. suggested one explanation. There was a general feeling that they (the black students interviewed) came to get something specific "to take back to the community," a set of skills of immediate relevance and applicability to physical and organizational needs as these students saw them. Faced with a choice between more traditional planning--with an emphasis on land use, housing development, public

facilities, etc.--and social planning, with the vagueness of its content and job prospects, they chose the former. There was, in addition, a feeling expressed that social planning was intended to sensitize "suburban" white middle-class students to conditions in poor or black areas, and that certainly was not something black students had to come to planning school to get.

There were no black faculty associated with the social planning programs in this study. (North Carolina had two black visiting lecturers during 1970-71 who offered courses that many social planning students elected. Efforts were underway to recruit a full-time person at the time of the site visit.)

Concurrently, the curriculum in individual programs provided only the most limited opportunities--through fieldwork, internships, advocacy projects, community participation, or whatever vehicle might facilitate such exposure--for experience in poor areas, in ghettos, other ethnic communities, or, on the other hand, with the caretakers and professionals directly involved in servicing or policing these communities.

I consider the narrowness of these programs--the limited opportunity they provide for experience of alternatives (alternative subcultures, life-styles, work styles, alternative political styles, perceptions of change)--a serious weakness. Programmatically, the effect is to close off exploration and to relegate any discussion of values to a level of abstraction that insures irrelevance, or worse, moral paralysis.

Student interviews at the projects offer a perspective on this. Taking the Master's programs as a group (North Carolina, Puerto Rico, Florida State,

and M.I.T.), students in general reported that they had become less activist* during their time in planning school--with the exception of Florida State, where the tendency was to report becoming somewhat more activist. In their patterns of involvement before coming to planning school, Florida State students were considerably less active than their counterparts at the other schools (reflecting perhaps the influence of the region of origin or their coming directly from undergraduate study versus experience working in Peace Corps/Vista-type groups. Controlling for student background the pattern of socialization appears remarkably consistent. The relatively liberal planning ideology tended to bring more conservative students "up" to a moderate level of politicization, and to depress the level of more active students back to a kind of moderate liberal mean.

The constraining effect of planning education that this problem of socialization suggests is highlighted by a study of Vista volunteers whose experience contrasts markedly with that of the planning students in the programs considered in this study. The largely white, middle-class, college-level background of the Vista volunteers in the sample would compare with the background of most planning students. According to the survey, after their Vista field service, over a third of the ex-volunteers (from a matched sample of 22,000) reported themselves as "radicalized," and another 50 percent reported a "more left" political and social posture, on the basis of their exposure to poverty, deprivation, corruption, and "the general failure of Government at all levels in relieving poverty conditions." The study

*Activism is used to indicate organizational activity or participation motivated by a political or social concern--political parties, NAACP, SDS, Field service.

concluded that because volunteers had "an opportunity to learn first hand about the extent of poverty and the extent of indifference, Vista seems to speed up the politicization process...at least two-thirds of all Vista respondents under age 30 responded negatively to their contracts with social agencies, local government agencies, and Federal Government agencies...(and) 48 percent of former volunteers under 30 said they were 'suspicious of all government-sponsored social change programs.'[7]

I am suggesting that in the training programs considered here, planning students, unlike the Vista volunteers in the sample, are not provided opportunities to test their ideas and awareness against the reality of poverty or deprivation, local government operations, or deliberate social change attempts.

The lack of a range of experience and of the tools necessary to conceptualize and organize this experience, leads social policy planners into a manipulative role and at the same time condemns them to ignorance of what they need most to know. In a similar vein, Charles Valentine has argued for an ethnographic approach to the study of poverty:

> Gradually, we should become less dependent on images of our people communicated to us by outsiders such as policemen or social workers, for we shall know the people ourselves firsthand. Eventually, we will come to regard those outsiders, not as authoritative sources of information, but as objects of study, to be examined in light of our growing experience of and through the subculture...It seems probable that the future ethnographer of the poor will have a clear knowledge of what lower class people want, he will have considerable understanding of what they are willing and able to do to get what they want. From this viewpoint it will seem obvious that politics and programs to 'eliminate poverty' have failed partly because they were designed and launched without any such knowledge or understanding.[8]

The suggestion is not that social planners become ethnographers, or Vista volunteers, or political radicals. Rather, the argument is that social policy planners should be as understanding and knowledgeable as possible, especially around those issues that arise from the impact of

governmentally planned programs on the lives of others, whether the poor, the black, or whatever subculture. Additionally, it is felt that a range of field experiences--in policy making or implementing agencies, with community groups, etc.--is an essential element in understanding how the system works, how outcomes are produced, and how institutions affect social problems and people.

Issues like rapport, elitism, professionalism and socialization are subsumed under the larger heading of values, and it is here that the programs under study would appear to be at their weakest: they have avoided systematic confrontation of the value issues involved in teaching and practicing social policy planning.

In raising these issues the point is not that training programs should impose a particular viewpoint on their students or faculty (although this is precisely what happens, at present, by socializing students to models and assumptions which are not made explicit). I am suggesting that much could be done to encourage faculty and students together to explore these areas.

The confrontation of value issues appears to be a source of confusion both in writing about social policy and in the programs under study here. At one level, there is an awareness that social policy planners and policy analysts need help in order to "crystallize their personal substantive values." Writing about the design of a policy science curriculum, Dror argues:

> There is no universally valid suggestion in this matter (of confronting value issues); much depends on finding inspirational teachers who can help the students in values exploration, perhaps within a student-managed framework.

> Exposing the students to vicarious experiences of human suffering may also be essential -- not through an internship in an "aid-giving" organization but by sharing for some time (about two months) the day-to-day life of some "miserables." In different conditions various activities are helpful: but let me repeat and emphasize the need to make an intense effort to sensitize students to humanity, standing above and beyond the clinical concepts and tools of policy sciences and their instrumental-Machiavellian character.[9]

None of the programs in the sample closely approached this level of institutionalized concern for the value questions inherent in social policy and conflicts between individual and policy making or organizational loyalties. Berkeley dealt with one aspect of this complex process: examination of the self in deliberate social change, using T-group and group process methods to get at individual values and feelings. These methods do not deal with the political or social context in which these conflicts arise and, moreover, may even raise further value issues which go undiscussed in a formal sense (e.g. do training planners in group processes serve to increase their propensity to manipulate client groups which presumably have not had this background?). In other programs, any exploration of values was done by groups of students together, or students with a particular faculty member informally (in some cases with a faculty member outside the social policy program). External variables -- a cosmopolitan and 'political' campus like Berkeley, or the radical-independence movement in Puerto Rico -- may affect the level of sophistication involved. In general, however, there has been no real attempt to deal with these issues in an institutional form.

But at another level, of course, value issues transcend personal substantive beliefs and feelings; and at this level programs have achieved even less. The need is not simply to provide opportunities to sensitize students to humanity or expose them to inspirational teachers, as the passage above suggests, but to confront the value issues inherent in the field of social policy. In other words, the real task should be to move beyond values in the sense of self-awareness (granting that this is important) and into exploration of the complex value issues in this field.

In addition to questions of interpretation, imposition of personal or class values on others, and manipulation, are a whole set of questions relating to the practice of social planning and its impact on people; the distribution and allocation of resources in social programs, the political system in which social policy planning occurs; "the nature of contemporary political and economic institutions, especially...the nature of the corporate organisms that have come to dominate modern life...the interests they serve...and the role of planners and planning in facilitating corporate activities";[10] the nature of deliberate social change, and whether its aims are to challenge the status quo or accommodate to it; the effect of social policy in 'cooling out' protest; the use of social programs to 'get people off the streets' and dissipate dissent. Many observers have discussed the variety and extent of value issues as they appear in social policy planning."

The failure to grapple effectively with the question of values, as well as the failure to move beyond the comprehensive rational planning model are part of the ideological and intellectual baggage held over from

traditional city planning. For the planning profession and planning education in particular, the 1960's was a period of chaotic transformation, during which there was a "general loss of faith in the profession's basic assumptions about the nature of urban problems and hence of the very foundations of its contribution to society."[12]

Social policy planning developed as one response to this challenge; but, unfortunately, the programs viewed here have not completely freed themselves from the burden of old city planning orthodoxies.

C. Social Policy Education in the University Setting

The relatively weak showing of the programs considered here--in terms of meeting stated objectives, establishing an integral field, and sustaining innovations in the teaching and learning of social policy--can be attributed in part to the hold-over effect of traditional assumptions and methods in city planning. It must also be attributed to the difficulty in setting up and maintaining an interdisciplinary program in the university setting. In this case, the objectives of the programs appear praiseworthy. However, given the obstacles faced and the kind of resources available, the expectations of both program planners and Metro Center administrators appear naive.

The central issue here, then, is not the particular mix of disciplines represented or not represented in the social policy programs, or the range of faculty policy-making experience, etc. At issue are the institutional structures in which programs are operated. The importance of the institutional base for effective crossing of disciplinary boundaries and the creation of viable interdisciplinary training cannot be stressed enough:

> ...the central internal problems of establishing and maintaining intellectual dialogue between faculty and of carrying out the educational task stem from the inherently interdisciplinary nature of public policy and the unique and necessary blend of basic and

> applied research characteristic of a professionally oriented program. The problem is that such a combination of disciplines and research approaches, left to its own devices, will seek the same steady state that characterizes the structure of academic institutions in the United States. The environmental forces are all towards separation rather than integration of the blend of disciplines, basic and applied research, and positive and normative theories.[13]

The pressure toward a steady state of separation and fragmentation must be considered as a primary obstacle to the kind of innovations the social policy planning programs proposed. It can be argued that:

> Perhaps the most intractable of the problems facing a university group for the study of public policy has its origins in the structure of academia in the United States. Knowledge and people are organized by disciplines. If a faculty member advances, in academia, it is through his discipline. His job mobility and status are almost always governed by his discipline. For the individual, membership in an interdisciplinary organization brings with it the risk of being cut off from his rewards structure and eliminating his job options.[14]

In practical terms, this means that faculty members must be--explicitly or implicitly--acceptable in standards of scholarship, research, and teaching to the disciplinary departments which surround the interdisciplinary program:

> If the disciplines are hostile, or even neutral, toward the mission or activities of a public policy unit, that unit will become or remain a second-class citizen in the university community. In establishing and maintaining an interdisciplinary unit, in a disciplinary structured university...the environmental determinant of long-run viability is a structure of supportive relationships with disciplinary units.[15]

Despite this, however, not one of the social policy planning programs in its funding application specified in detail how the objective of a multidisciplinary training program could be achieved, what particular institutional obstacles characterized the local university setting, and how these could be overcome given the constraints of resources and personnel under the control of program administrators. These considerations were not given primary attention in either the planning stage or in program

implementation...Taken together, the programs did not enjoy strong supportive relationships with other disciplinary units. There were some joint appointments, for example, between city planning and law, or political science, and these are a step in the right direction, given program objectives. In the absence of strong supportive relationships with other disciplinary departments, however, a social planning program must attempt to provide from within a range of courses that exceeds available resources.

In setting up an organizational form to contain an interdisciplinary unit, such as a social planning program, several options are available. (Basically, these are alternative combinations of three variables:[16] the form of faculty appointment--joint with a disciplinary department or independent by interdisciplinary unit; financial support--hard university funds or soft grant funds; and curriculum control--whether dependent on courses offered in departments or independent with internal control over courses and staffing. Eight permutations are possible, some of which are not viable at all.)

Each permutation has associated strengths and weaknesses. In the Berkeley program, as an example, a core faculty, which is a mix of independent and joint appointments, provides a home base for students who utilize the offerings of a number of established departments. Naturally, the core faculty have no control over course content offered outside their own program. They are limited in their ability to monitor their students' progress in these outside areas. While students are exposed to the larger university, utilization of existing course material offered in other departments has its disadvantages. Offerings are frequently keyed to requirements and advancement within the disciplinary department. Material of relevance to social policy students, for example, may be scattered over a number of courses in a given department.

This program form, with faculty inputs scattered, implies that faculty are not placed in an interdisciplinary position. Alonso notes:

> In programs of instruction based on this approach, it is all too common for the individual members of the interdisciplinary faculty to offer courses in their own specialties, with little or no idea of the content of the rest of the curriculum. There are hopes that somehow the students will be able to synthesize all of this, but since mature scholars are unable to do it, it seems unlikely that students will succeed.[17]

An alternative form places control over curriculum in the interdisciplinary unit (students may take courses elsewhere, but core material considered central to the program is offered under the control of the program). The faculty again may be independent or joint appointees, or a combination. The two public policy programs referred to above (Berkeley and Harvard) are of this type. Both have independent faculties, and in a variety of ways (joint teaching, workshops, colloquia, program planning, syndicates, etc.) attempt to maintain interfaculty communication. This approach underlines the critical importance of control over curriculum content and staffing. Writing of a public policy program, one writer cautions, "It is mandatory that curriculum content be under the control of the public policy unit. To have control over content means to have control over staffing. In an area without adequate texts, without a tradition, and without an existing body of teaching materials, the usual informal controls of course content found in most disciplines are missing. A coherent curriculum requires close supervision."[18]

Clearly, there is no single "right way" to run an interdisciplinary program. The intention here is to suggest that the choice of alternative patterns in staffing, curriculum control, and departmental relations requires careful evaluation and realistic planning. It is one thing to describe an ideal social planning program, for example, and quite another to specify how, in a particular department and university, interdisciplinary

ties can be established and maintained.

In terms of the programs discussed here, the "steady state" of academic institutions has tended to promote separation and fragmentation of disciplines, etc., and at the same time has tended to keep programs locked into city planning departments. The failure to maintain stronger external ties to disciplinary departments has tended to increase the amount of influence the traditional city planning curriculum has held over developing social policy planning options. In many cases program directors and faculty were not able to transcend the traditional limitations of city planning education, limitations which include the generalist nature of the training, the lack of basic research or policy-making experience, and the lack of a representative study body. It has traditionally been claimed, for example, that the planner's primary contribution stems from his knowledge

> of the urban system, and from his ability to design, if primarily a technician, and implement, if primarily an administrator, strategies for positive intervention within that system.[19]

Yet this claim to exclusive "knowledge of the urban system" has been challenged by a number of other disciplines, notably urban economics, political science, and sociology. But critics have observed that, in any case, this knowledge tended to be superficial, to be used graphically and not analytically, and to be unduly restricted to land use patterns. Methods were ad hoc and conventional, when compared with those utilized by economics and sociology, and the emphasis on professionalism stressed practice over scholarship and research. It has been argued that course offerings are "woefully inadequate" and that "too many planners leave school unequipped to construct, or even evaluate, the quantitative models and techniques increasingly employed in urban analysis."[70]

A final factor which can work to block establishment of effective

interdisciplinary programs is the form of financial support. The grants for the four social policy planning programs supported by the NIMH were primarily budgeted for staffing--to cover faculty appointments. Because this support is provided only for the life of the grant, funds are "soft." It is argued that soft funds make it impossible to develop long-term faculty commitments to the program, and that these commitments are essential in order to assemble a fully effective social policy planning faculty. Our sample of programs tends to confirm this argument. The nature of the funding provided may itself be a factor in the general failure of the NIMH grant support (soft) programs to develop indices of real interdisciplinary teaching.

The two public policy programs (Berkeley and Harvard) offer a contrast in this respect. Both have a more independent status and operate with a larger proportion of hard, university supplied funds. Both have been able to initiate organizational forms that are, in theory at least, more interdisciplinary and more autonomous.

The fact that the four NIMH supported programs have had to operate with soft funds may explain in part why more progress has not been achieved. If this is true, it is still another area in which program planners and administrators have entertained somewhat naive expectations regarding program goals. If the objective is the creation of long-term interdisciplinary faculty, the appropriate mechanism is probably not soft grant funds. This suggests that perhaps funding should be utilized in other areas of program development. In any case, it is another instance where appropriate institutional forms and control mechanisms must be matched with desired objectives.

Alternative institutional forms and inventions are, of course,

possible and quite likely will emerge, perhaps as a degree-granting school with teaching and research performed by a series of flexible committees; an inter-university degree program--a national school of social policy, for example, in which students spend time at a number of sites and work with a number of faculty; or autonomous degree-granting institutes which cut across disciplinary lines according to communality of interest of faculty and students.

The difficulty in establishing and maintaining interdisciplinary programs in the university setting has led some to explore other possibilities. One approach is the Rand Corporation Teaching Program in Policy Analysis, in which students are taught in the midst of on-going policy research. There are a number of organizations which could potentially serve this function, ranging from the better known ones like Rand, the Urban Institute, and the Stanford Research Institute to a number of smaller institutes with more specialized (health, housing, ract, etc.) interests, including radical political analysis. One of the intriguing aspects of this organizational variety is that students could explore social policy analysis in a much greater range of political or social change contexts that the university-based programs would seem to be providing. Still another option of special relevance to social policy planning could be developed around community-based organizations bringing together students, academics, and neighborhood people in a variety of unorthodox but potentially exciting ways. Then too, labor unions or Alinsky-type organizations may have possibilities as presently untapped sites for systematic social policy learning.

The obstacles facing interdisciplinary programs are formidable. The programs under consideration here were not, as a group, successful

in overcoming them. Perhaps the ultimate failing is that programs were not bold enough in exploring or inventing alternative institutional forms to meet their objectives.

D. Losing Touch with Reality: Social Policy Planning and the Status Quo

I noted above a tendency for programs in this study to "drift" from a motivating concern for poverty, racism, and institutional and social structural change, back to an emphasis on social service delivery--questions of efficiency, coordination, etc. From another perspective, this is a drift away from a basic redefinition of the planning mission, to include social-institutional change, back to identification with pre-existing professional methods and approaches. Nor are these examples unique in the larger field of social policy: in an analysis of OEO projects, an observer calculated that 94 percent of individual projects were social services oriented, despite OEO's stated commitment to basic social change. Similarly, study of Model Cities-funded programs in nine cities indicated that 95 percent of the individual projects are service oriented, despite the initial stated objectives of that program.[21]

The search for a common origin to these observations leads back to the basic patterns of thought which shape views of social structure, social change, and objectives.

Roland Warren, in an examination of aspects of an "institutionalized thought structure," has suggested one approach to the conceptualization of these patterns. "Considered together, these aspects constitute an interlocking, mutually-supporting cognitive ordering of the poverty problem which is reflected not only in a knowledge and belief system but in the social structure of the interactional field of those organizations which are legitimated to address the problem."[22]

The orienting concepts for this discussion are drawn from Kuhn's work on scientific revolutions and the role of paradigms in shaping these revolutions. Kuhn sees "scientific development" as a succession of tradition-bound periods punctuated by non-cumulative breaks...[23]

Rather than representing a process of gradual accumulation of knowledge, new discoveries mark discontinuities, or revolutions, in development. These discontinuities introduce new ways of conceptualizing, of evaluating data, and of conducting and sanctioning research. The acceptance of a new paradigm involves acceptance of an entire set of new theoretical statements, methods, and tests. "In learning a paradigm, the scientist acquires theory, methods, and standards together, usually in an inextricable mixture."[24] What is most useful in Kuhn's analysis, for the purposes here, is the notion that a paradigm cannot be accepted independently of a larger body of thought--involving reformulation of problem definition, data, and research--embedded in it.

Warren adapts this model to the analysis of Model Cities programs. From his observations, he draws two "diagnostic paradigms"--diagnosing and conceptualizing poverty and social problems--both of which are common formulations in discussions of poverty causation: dysfunctional social structure, and individual deficiency. The former looks to aspects of the social structure which produce poverty and seeks change in these aspects; the latter is oriented to the inability of individuals to function within accepted norms, and looks for changes in the individuals. Warren asserts that "in actual practice, just as Kuhn indicates for the natural sciences, the choice of either paradigm presumes a different conceptual framework, steers attention to different variables, poses problems of a different order, and suggests different methods of approach to solve these problems."

> Hence, there are at present two competing diagnostic paradigms, each of which calls attention to different components of the problem, each of which can be granted 'face' validity. But as will be shown, only one of these diagnostic paradigms, the approach based on individual deficiency, is part of an institutionalized thought structure.[23]

The components of the institutionalized thought structure ("the interrelationship between thought system and social structure") associated with the individual deficiency paradigm can be described in terms of a number of analytical components, in practice interwoven in complex fashion. Treated in sequence, these components include:

1. An intervention strategy of providing services to rehabilitate and assist a disadvantaged population to perform as "normal" members of society. These include most of the services mentioned in terms of social policy planning--education, manpower programs, social group work, health services, etc. Attention is given to improving the social service delivery systems--correcting organizational or social factors which impede efficient delivery.

2. A supporting belief-value system which includes the assumption that American society, with all its problems, "is essentially sound in its institutional composition." Progress is possible in solving persistent social problems. Democratic pluralism opens governmental processes to all who wish to participate, and a variety of interest groups can organize and press their points. Additional aspects are identified in the belief-system, including faith in the beneficial advance of science, the ability of organizational reform to overcome problems of bureaucracy and unresponsiveness and in inducement or side payments used to facilitate change in organizational behavior.

3. Technical and administrative rationales that dictate the nature of the organizational response to poverty and social problems. Comprehensiveness is the rationale for a complete array of services and a proliferation of varieties of service and service agencies. This requires coordination to allocate resources among agencies, and to provide non-redundant packages of services to clients. Technical efficiency facilitates both of these processes.

4. Legitimation--"the right of an organization to operate in a particular field"--derives from the "public interest," and provides power to control access to resources, to define problems, to say what must be done, and to control interventions, and evaluate them.

5. Social research and evaluation, which direct attention to studies which can be applied to the analysis of service delivery problems, research on delivery systems, client populations, client attempts to influence policy, and evaluation.

6. The characteristics of the interorganizational field--the network of community decision organizations, in the Warren study--which tend towards surprising stability:

"Organizational domains remained substantially the same, and taken as a whole the organizations were able to absorb the impact from Federal programs and local disadvantaged groups with a minimum of noticeable change either as individual organizations or in relationship to each other."[26]

The implications of alternative paradigms extend beyond program administration and organizational performance into areas of evaluation and research. Evaluating the impact of a particular social intervention also involves a choice between the two competing paradigms. What appears as significant social change when viewed from the perspective of the individual

deficiency paradigm will appear as a minor adjustment in a particular delivery system when seen from an alternative paradigm. Social change, in this light, becomes highly relative, with judgments reflecting more the initial assumptions of the beholder than actual objective conditions. And it is not only the process of evaluation that is relative, but the meanings of key variables employed to discuss social programs--the nature of terms like innovation, participation, responsiveness, etc., depend very much on the position of the person or organization using them.

In similar fashion, the thought patterns associated with the social policy planning programs in this study can profitably be viewed as an aspect of an institutionalized thought structure which compares in many respects with that presented above. Not surprisingly, given the links between planning practice and professional education, and given the historical inter-relatedness of the development of the Model Cities program and city planning schools, observations of the Model Cities program, as presented in the Warren study, appear to be equally valid when applied to the social policy planning programs which together comprise this sample.

The paradigmatic nature of the thought pattern associated with these social policy planning programs is worth elaborating because it sets the limits--both in terms of role innovation and research boundaries--of exploration within these programs. It suggests that many of the factors that have been discussed independently in the preceding sections are, at another level, interrelated, constitutive elements of a single pattern.

The continuing identification with traditional professional assumptions and methods; the lack of innovation in teaching methods and materials; the lack of field experience; the narrowness of the perspectives on the field of social policy and appropriate training and work roles; the

reliance on incrementalism, and the working within the context of current government programs--all these are elements in a pattern of thought that treats the social system as basically benevolent and holds that social problems can be cured by way of rational analysis and technical efficiency. The programs have not served as a forum for the exploration of alternatives in teaching and research, or for the development of alternative diagnostic paradigms or theories of social structure. The status quo orientation of the programs in the most basic areas of social structure and poverty analysis may account for the lack of innovation found in program performance or in thinking and teaching about social problems.

In their basic orientation to social structure theory, the programs start with a systems view of social structure. Significantly, Warren identified and elaborated a "social system paradigm" which is logically related to the individual deficiency diagnostic paradigm (the former relating to social theory, the latter to explanations of poverty causation).* This paradigm asserts a social system "ontologically and methodologically prior" to its participants, and directs attention to "the social interaction of individual actors in its aggregate structure, whether at the level of small group, or any more inclusive level including the total society."[27]

A content analysis of the programs considered in this study suggests strongly that the programs are indeed oriented to this paradigm. The Berkeley proposal, for example, bases its program on "the ecological

---

*An alternative social system paradigm is postulated by Warren. It parallels the diagnostic paradigm viewing the social system as dysfunctional, and concentrates on "the social interaction of individual actors from the standpoint of those actors, rather than from the standpoint of their aggregate interaction...The key notion...is that of autonomous man, able to realize his full potential and to create a truly human social order only when freed from external constraint."

systems model that views social systems as open, self-organizing, self-regulating, and adaptive complexes of interacting and interdependent subsystems.[28] All other programs use this view as their starting premise, and emphasize, both in language and concept, the priority of the larger social system. The initial orientation to the larger system makes the actions of individuals problematical and emphasizes an overriding concern for system maintenance which directs attention towards sources of disequilibrium in the system.

The implications of systems maintenance are clear when the programs turn to diagnosis and developing an intervention strategy. Without exception, they start with an orientation to major social problems--poverty, racism, participation, the cluster of urban problems, etc. Indeed, it was the urgency of these problems that stimulated the development of social policy planning as an alternative to traditional planning in the first place. But from this starting point, there is a decided "drift" away from the social structural implications of the initial problem sanction towards one which stresses service delivery, planning, and in short, what the profession knows best--ameliorative adjustments within the context of given parameters.

As an example, the Berkeley proposal states, "...we are most likely to alleviate the major problem that is now manifest in our cities, if we apply intelligence to designing multi-dimensional program-bundles that are coherent and mutually reinforcing." Further, "we have traditionally conceived urban and human services as categorically independent functions, seldom as tactical inputs to a developmental strategy...it has become apparent that the bureaucratic boundaries do not coincide with the boundaries of the social subsystems...We expect that these new approaches to programming public actions will increase our capacities for rationalizing the

social services and for increasing their payoffs, especially to those in the society who are most dependent and who most need help because they are least able to help themselves." At the same, "any effective plan for public services must also be a plan for the reorganization of the agencies and procedures through which the services are to be supplied."[29]

Clearly, this conforms to the institutionalized thought structure associated with the individual deficiency diagnostic paradigm described above. To help deviant individuals--"those least able to help themselves" --adjust to the system, the delivery of social services must be "rationalized" (comprehensiveness, coordination, etc.) and service agencies and procedures "reorganized." The sphere of what can be changed in the system has been narrowed to discussion of more effective planning for the delivery of services. This also clarifies what many individual faculty members mean when they discuss their primary orientation to an "analytical framework for solving problems": activity within the constraints of what is given in the system. Rather than challenge these constraints, they propose planning activities based on coordination, more effective communication, and increased sensitivity.

The intervention strategy of improving services is based on rationalization by utilizing "a body of professional planners who are trained to deal with urban social problems in a comprehensive and integrated manner (i.e., from a systems perspective)...[30] "New insights of the management and political sciences do offer new guides for accomplishing functional (service) integration, even in the context of organizational rigidity. (The effective integration of the three military services is a dramatic case in point)...comprehensive planning for the social services must rather be a process of looking outward from one's own focus of activity in search of its relations to other activities and in an

attempt to fit the one to the others...the social policies planner would be an investment counsellor in the human services."[31]

The supporting belief system stresses "working within the system," and the importance of pluralism and consensus. "Power, authority, and influence are widely distributed among the many competing groups that mark our pluralistic, highly developed, urban society.[32] Another program asserts that social problems are empirically by-products of processes of continuing social change. Four characteristics of social change in American and western society--industrialization, immigration, urbanization, and bureaucratization--constitute the primary social changes, themes from which modern social problems have emerged."[33]

Taken together, these statements present a remarkably complacent picture of current social and institutional change. Conspicuously, missing in the treatment of social problems is any mention of inequality, the systematic patterns of income distribution, the distribution of power, and the cleavages of race. The program statements accept a pluralist model unchallenged.

These issues are raised within the context of a discussion of ways of thinking about social planning for an important reason. The concern is not that programs should accept a particular point of view, but that they could provide a forum for the exploration of alternatives as they relate to social policy. The argument has been that the acceptance--often implicitly and without challenge--of one particular paradigm violates both the intellectual and social basis for these programs. Thus, these are not charges against the practice of social planning (which is confounded by pressures imposed by organizational requirements, political necessity, personal needs, etc.) but against the restrictive way of thinking that appears to characterize these training programs.

This restrictive narrowness is certainly reflected in the approach to social change that emerges from these programs. Both the instrumental and clinical types of programs share a systems manipulation model in which change is effected by the provision of information--in the form of analysis, rationalization, problem-solving, etc. This, of course, assumes that the system in question is basically rational in operation and effect, and is able and willing to change and adapt in response to information. In the context of analyzing urban systems, as these programs propose, the requirements for information become infinitely complex, voracious, and perhaps impossible to fulfill. Elaborating in detail the variables and interrelationships of any of a number of seemingly bounded urban systems would be a formidable task, and if policy has to wait for its completion, action will be a long time coming. It is not just that systems theory is conservative in its focus on systems maintenance, as is often charged, but that role and change models derived from it have a sort of diversionary character.

This is not to say that a model of change based on the provision of information is invalid, but to sugges that it is not the only model of deliberate social change available for exploration. As a corollary to this, one could argue that it is unduly limiting to base programs presumably intended to probe social policy in all its dimensions on so narrow a base.

This can be turned around. There are a variety of models of the social change process (ranging from revolution to education, personal discovery, radical advocacy, contagion, and systems manipulation). The policy process is complex (including stages of initiation; staffing and planning communications and publicity institutional sanction intra-elite organizing; financing and sanction and control; combined with a

complex assessment of leverage points pertinent to these temporal and administrative states).[34] There are alternative strategies of intervention (organization of the poor, transfer of power, change in the opportunity structure),[35] conceptions of technical and administrative competence that lie outside of the prevaling paradigm, and research and evaluation modes that are based on different objectives and interest. And there is the need to know much more about strategies of action and implementation, about outcomes and the impact of planned programs, and about the role of values.

Despite the range of models and variables, these programs as a group have tended to focus on a narrow segment. I have argued that observed aspects of this segment constitute components of an institutionalized thought structure based on particular paradigms of social structure and problem diagnosis. Once the choice of paradigm is made, whether explicit or implicit, programs are "locked in" to patterns of thinking and acting that defeat the stated educational objectives (i.e. exploring new roles, including symmetrical professional client roles, initiating wide fieldwork experiences, development of new techniques and methods, and elimination of cleavages represented by income distribution and race).

The "locking in" effect of these paradigms is not limited to these social planning programs, or to Model Cities. It applies as well to city planning programs, or to Model Cities. It applies as well to city planning in general, to policy science programs, to social policy, to much of social science. In another context, Van der Berg observed of the sociology of race relations:

> ...much of the work done by North Americans in the area of race has, until the last three or four years...been strongly flavored with a great deal of optimism and complacency about the basic 'goodness' of American society and with the cautions, slightly left of center, reformist, meliorative, gradualist approach of 'liberal' intellectuals... American social scientists have leaned heavily towards political liberalism, which is a variant of conservative order theory. The field has been dominated by a functionalist view of society and a

definition of race problems as one of integration and assimilation of minorities into the mainstream of a consensus-based society.[36]

Van der Berg argued that the functionalist view of contemporary society tends to ignore the relative absence of consensus, asymmetry in power, roles, and rewards, and the segmental nature of the cleavages of race.

Similarly, the functionalist view of social policy pervades these programs:

> If there is one common thread that unites all aspects of social policy and distinguishes them from merely economic policy, it is the thread of what has elsewhere been called the 'integrative system'... The institutions with which social policy is especially concerned... all reflect degrees of integration and community. By and large it is an objective of social policy to build the identity of a person around some community with which he is associated.[37]

Put this way, the issue is not whether social integration is a worthy objective, but how and on whose terms it is to take place. It is worth repeating Charles Valentine's words: "For social criticism and discussion of social policy still to remain founded on notions of 'political integration' into the existing social system with some reformist 'concessions' suggests that liberal intellectuals have lost touch both with the objective conditions of oppression and with the subjective mood of people in the most deprived communities.[38]

In this sense, starting from a premise or paradigm that assumes consensus and pluralism unmarred by structural cleavages is likely to lead into an intellectual blind-alley, to outright rejection of programs by so-called target populations. And finally, it can also frustrate the objective of building one's identity.

1. H. Gans, "Proposal for a School of (National and Urban) Policies Planning at M.I.T., "memo to Department of Urban Studies and Planning, M.I.T. unpublished.

2. University of North Carolina, Department of City and Regional Planning, Application for Training Grant, op. cit., p. 35.

3. M. Webber, "Comprehensive Planning and Social Responsibility," JAIP, V. XXXIX, (Nov. 1963), p. 232-41.

4. Rein, op. cit., p. 250.

5. H. Gans, THE URBAN VILLAGERS, (Glencoe: Free Press, 1963), p. 273-276.

6. Ibid., p. 273-76.

7. "Vista and its Volunteers," NEW YORK TIMES (New York), May 24, 1971, p. 1.

8. C. A. Valentine, CULTURE AND POVERTY, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968), p. 149.

9. Dror, "The Teaching of Policy Sciences," op. cit., p. 112-13.

10. F. F. Piven, "Comprehensive Social Planning: Curriculum Reform or Professional Imperialism?" JAIP, Vol. 36, No. 4 (July 1970), p. 228.

11. Observers of planning practice and education have raised a number of value questions:

> Frequently however this so-called social planning is only a modernized version of the previous attempts to impose middle-class ways on the low income population, with 'human renewal' education and social work schemes to 'rehabilitate' the slum dwellers while -- or even in lieu of -- improving their living conditions, thus.... maintaining the present inequality of the low income population. H. Gans, "Social Planning: Urban and Regional Planning, op. cit., p. 135.
>
> ....(culture of poverty) formulations support the long-established rationalization of blaming poverty on the poor....conventional welfare approaches have often had the effect of perpetuating and reinforcing the dependency and powerlessness of the poor....as long as the 'war on poverty' is focused mainly on changing the supposed customs and values of the poor -- rather than

on altering the economic and political structure of the nation, it will have little effect on poverty. Valentine, op. cit., p. 155-56.

....one group exploits another via the planning process and....planning education is subordinated to the logic of this process. F. Obinani, "Planning Education in the Environment of Poverty: Training Resident Planners in Bedford-Stuyvesant," JAIP Vol. 36, No. 4, (July 1970) p. 261.

Major developments in professional education do not occur because someone has a good idea or a worried conscience. They are a reflection of manpower needs in the larger society....(professional schools) equip professionals with the skills and ideology needed by the institutions in which they will work. Piven, op. cit., p. 227.

While comprehensive social planning no doubt means that planners will now become involved in a variety of public activities other than physical planning.... it does not mean that these activities will thereby become instruments of substantial reform....The new emphasis on a comprehensive social planning approach seems to me to reflect a continuing process of expansion and consolidation among government agencies, the professions that staff them, and the private organizations that support them. Piven, op. cit., p. 227.

Professionals are increasingly becoming the gatekeepers of the welfare state, deciding on 'professional' grounds who receives what kind of services. S. M. Miller and F. Riessman, SOCIAL CLASS AND SOCIAL POLICY, (N. Y.: Basic Books, 1968), p. 226-27.

12. W. Doebele, "Making Planning Education Relevant: A proposal," JAIP Vol. 36, No. 4 (July 1970), p. 269.

13. Crecine, op. cit., p. 31.

14. Ibid., p. 20.

15. Ibid., p. 22.

16. Ibid., p. 23-26.

17. W. Alonso, "Beyond the Inter-disciplinary Approach to Planning," Center for Planning and Development Research Working Paper No. 90, (Nov. 1968), Institute of Urban and Regional Development, University of California, Berkeley, p. 8.

18. Crecine. op. cit., p. 24.

19. Brooks and Stegman, op. cit., p. 285.

20. J. Kain, "Rampant Schizophrenia: The Case of City and Regional Planning," in JAIP, V. 36, No. 4 (July 1970), p. 222-23.

21. S. Rose, COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS: THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INITIAL CONCEPTION OF THE POVERTY PROBLEM, DERIVED INTERVENTION STRATEGY, AND PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION, cited in R. Warren, "The Sociology of Knowledge and the Problems of the Inner Cities," (unpublished manuscript, Florence Heller Graduate School for Advanced Studies in Social Welfare, Brandeis University, Waltham, Massachusetts), p. 10.

22. Warren, op. cit., p. 1.

23. T. S. Kuhn, THE STRUCTURE OF SCIENTIFIC REVOLUTIONS, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970), p. 208.

24. Ibid., p. 109.

25. Warren, op. cit., p. 11.

26. Ibid., p. 26.

27. Ibid., p. 35-36.

28. University of California at Berkeley, Department of City and Regional Planning, "Application for Training Grant," op. cit., p. 12-14. emphasis added.

29. Ibid., p. 12-14.

30. University of North Carolina, Department of City and Regional Planning, "Application for Training Grant," op. cit., p. 35.

31. University of California at Berkeley, Department of City and Regional Planning, "Application," op. cit., p. 15, emphasis added.

32. Ibid., p. 14.

33. Florida State University, Department of Urban and Regional Planning, "Application for Training Grant," op. cit., p. 30.

34. K. Gergen, "Assessing the Leverage Points in the Process of Policy Formation," p. 185ff, in R. Bauer and K. Gergen, THE STUDY OF POLICY FORMATION, (New York: Free Press, 1968), pp. 181-205.

35. Warren, op. cit., p. 61.

36. P. L. Van der Berg, RACE AND RACISM, (New York: John Wiley, 1967), p. 6.

37. K. E. Boulding, "The Boundaries, of Social Policy," in SOCIAL WORK, Vol. 12, No. 1, (Jan. 1967), p. 7.

38. Valentine, Charles A., "Social Policy: Promise and Performance," in Letters from Readers, SOCIAL POLICY, V. 1, No. 3, (Sept. - October, 1970), p. 50.

APPENDIX I: ILLUSTRATIVE COURSE LISTINGS

A. Florida State University, Department of Urban and Regional Planning

B. M. I. T., Department of Urban Studies and Planning

C. Brandeis University, Florence Heller Graduate School for Advanced Studies in Social Welfare

D. Harvard University, Kennedy School of Government, Program in Public Policy

I -- A. Florida State University, Department of Urban and Regional Planning. Departmental Course Listings:

General Courses

UPL 500 PLANNING AND URBANISM (3), I, III, IV

Introduction to planning concepts, literature and history. The role of planning in the urban context-social, political, and physical. The influence of historic urban attitudes and institutions.

UPL 501 PLANNING THEORY IN PRACTICE (3), I

The ideology and techniques of the planning process; assumptions, goals, standards, priorities and directions of change. Planning as activity and as process.

UPL 502 PLANNING LEGISLATION (3), III

Legal concepts and legislation basic to planning in a democratic society. Analysis and evaluation of the principal devices available for the effectuation of planning policy: enabling legislation, zoning, land development controls, housing and building codes, and urban renewal.

UPL 503 COMMUNITY FACILITIES PLANNING (3), II, IV

Study of the factors involved in planning community facilities and services. Consideration of the broad aspects of public health, sanitation, and municipal engineering. Relationships of urban development and public systems including transportation, education, recreation, utilities, and protection.

UPL 504 HISTORY OF URBAN FORM (3), II

Cultural and technological changes affecting planning theories and urban forms. Historical survey of urban form and its relation to economic, social and functional factors.

UPL 505 PLANNING RESEARCH (3), I

The nature and purposes of research in planning. Group analysis of content and method of individual research projects and proposals. Preparation and presentation of an individual research study.

UPL 506 URBAN SPATIAL STRUCTURE I (3), I

Examination of social, economic and technical factors and trends underlying the spatial structuring and planning for urban settlements. Consideration of the behavior of space users and structural influences on urban life and form. Examination of theories, models and empirical research concerned with urban spatial structure.

UPL 507 PLANNING METHODS I (3), I

Introduction to stochastic and deterministic processes as employed in planning technology. Statistical reasoning and probability concepts applicable to urban and regional models.

UPL 508 URBAN SPATIAL STRUCTURE II (3), II

Study of accepted and potential methods and techniques of urban analysis. Major elements of the comprehensive planning process. Data processing, mathematical analysis, and models of urban systems.

UPL 509 PLANNING METHODS II (3), II

509 a Planning Programming
509 b Comprehensive Planning

A field exercise using analytical and planning methods to develop proposals for an actual urban area. Concentrated experience in applied comprehensive planning as a team operation.

UPL 510 URBANISM SEMINAR (3) (on demand)

Advanced consideration of urban trends and their implications for planning. Examination of urban life and form in terms of problems of government, social structure, environmental health, physical obsolescence, and technology. Critical study of theories of urbanism and planning practices. Interdisciplinary faculty participation.

UPL 511 PLANNING THEORY SEMINAR (3), II

Exploration in depth of the fundamental bases of planning. Critical examination of current planning theory and theories in the social sciences related to planning. Formulation of guidelines for comprehensive planning theory.

UPL 512 URBAN ECONOMIC PLANNING I (3)

Focuses on the determinants of city size and urban growth. Future of small urban places analyzed in detail. Proper role of public policy in influencing the location of economic activity discussed and analyzed.

UPL 513 URBAN ECONOMIC PLANNING II (3)

Survey the economic literature dealing with the planning for urban problems. Goals of the urban economy discussed in detail. Policy implication of various goals analyzed.

UPL 514 PUBLIC FINANCIAL PLANNING (3), III

Familiarizes the student with methods of evaluating the economic impact of government investment projects. Optimal role of government in a market economy analyzed in detail. Relationship between these investment criteria and program budgeting discussed.

UPL 515 PLANNING SYSTEMS ANALYSIS (3), II

Advanced study of analysis techniques for planning. Critical evaluation of theories and applications in land use and transportation models.

UPL 517 OPERATIONS RESEARCH IN PLANNING (3), III

Advanced topics in the use of deterministic and stochastic models for urban and regional analysis. The introduction of current methodology of transportation studies, land use modelling and prediction, and the simulation of regional development.

UPL 518 PLANNING INFORMATION SYSTEMS (3), III

Current research and developments in urban information systems, with emphasis upon the decision-making needs of planners and public officials. Principles of urban data processing systems for state and local governments. Elements of computer programming and systems design. Basic coverage of automatic data processing.

UPL 519 ADVANCED PLANNING PROBLEMS II (3), I, IV

Select One

519 a Spatial Planning
519 b Regional Planning
519 c Urban Design

Specialized planning processes and problems for various scales of the human environment. Emphasis on applicability of available techniques. Studio problem requiring development of detailed planning proposal within student's area of specialization.

Social Planning

UPL 530 SOCIAL PLANNING PRINCIPLES (3), I

Introduce the generalist planner to an intensive exploration and evaluation of social planning. Produce a broad framework to which other courses within the specialty of social planning will relate. Through readings, papers, projects, seminars, outside lecturers, and team-taught sessions, investigate the basic concepts of social planning and their history. Survey present practices. Present the determinants and dynamics of various theories of social change, along with methods of formulating and testing social goal projections, determining ways of achievement, cost assignment and feasibility. Stress the relationship of social planning to the entire process of planning, emphasizing positive alternative courses of action designed to reflect social needs in future physical development.

UPL 531 EXPERIENTIAL FOUNDATIONS FOR PLANNING PRACTICE (3), I, IV

Exploration in self-knowledge by students of urban planning and related fields. Scientific and professional considerations in a planning career. Self-assessment of intellectual, sensory, and emotional characteristics. The planner's functioning in relation to that of key individuals and organizations important to the planning process. Emphasis will be placed on the planner's development of ethical sensitivity to the social implications of his work.

UPL 532 MAN AND THE URBAN ENVIRONMENT (3), I

Basic concepts of human nature and individual development as criteria for assessing the urban environment. Urban conditions contributing to pathology and to personality growth. Challenges to the planner in the control of urban environments. Team taught, with psychology representative and others. Laboratory component provides familiarization with psychological tools relevant to the planning process.

UPL 533 BEHAVIORAL BASES FOR PLANNED CHANGE (3), II

Social context of community life. Community influences in social development, levels of health, and social adjustment. Program strategies for social control and change. Team taught, with sociology or social-psychology representative and others. Exercises based on planning issues in the broad context of community mental health.

UPL 534 POLICY PLANNING FOR SOCIAL CHANGE (3), III

Functioning of public and private organizations involved in social planning and action in the United States at the state and metropolitan levels. Importance of these agencies to the city planner and to the effectiveness of the comprehensive planning process in areas of social planning. Team taught, with social welfare representative and others. Exploration of social planning challenges through case history studies and problem simulations.

UPL 535 HOUSING AND URBAN REDEVELOPMENT SEMINAR (3), I

Economic, social, political and physical considerations in the production and supply of housing. The evolving perspective of national housing policy. Studies in market, finance, design, social impact, legislation, and urban renewal.

UPL 536 URBAN HOUSING: PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT OF SOCIAL OPPORTUNITY (3), II

Investigate the following aspects of planning for housing in the urban setting: the process-past and present-of urban growth with emphasis on the distribution of housing. Consider housing as a factor in ecological

UPL 536 URBAN HOUSING: PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT OF SOCIAL OPPORTUNITY (continued)

patterns: the operation of housing markets, their response to economic, financial and other factors, and their disfunctions in relation to minority and lower economic groups; the structure and operation of housing development, the financing process and their effect on development patterns and population distribution. Concepts of income distribution through housing assistance, and processes of subsidized housing development, and the past and potential impact of such programs on population and development patterns. Consideration given housing in the planning process as developed to date and the implications of recent federal grant programs and regulations. Existing methodologies in housing analysis and the market analysis approach and other concepts as potential basic planning tools. Role of planning and housing in developing social opportunities in the metropolitan community.

UPL 537 URBAN HOUSING: DESIGN AND PRODUCTION (3), II

Provide a concentrated investigation of design and development of the housing environment and of the relationships between housing communities and social processes. Through readings, projects, and seminars, survey the state of the art in housing production and neighborhood design, and the potential distribution of technological advances. Consider the public influence on design and production through formal controls and the effect of related policies and programs.

UPL 538 HOUSING IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES (3)

A multi-disciplinary approach to analyzing housing within the larger context of urbanization and economic growth in the developing nations. Rates of city growth are related to changes in the supply of housing. Attention is given to successful national housing programs, to the nature and source of major obstacles in the development of adequate housing programs, to the role of public housing, to the economic significance of the decision to build or not to build, to the objectives that housing is supposed to accomplish and how the establishment of both housing and neighborhood standards affects the ability to realize these objectives, to techniques of establishing national housing targets, to the role of the construction industry in national development, and to the significance of different housing and land use patterns for the ability of cities to function efficiently and effectively. In joining the economic and social aspects of housing, a better understanding is given of the problem of housing, city growth, and economic development.

Urban Design

UPL 540 URBAN DESIGN SEMINAR (3), II

Critical evaluation of approaches to urban design as evidenced in readings, projects, and theoretical models of urban form. Implications of design goals and processes for future urban environments. Considerations of activities systems as form generators.

UPL 541 PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT AND SOCIAL BEHAVIOR (3), II

The interrelationships of the physical environment and psycho-social experience and behavior. Concentrates on the scales of physical environment within the planner's concern, ranging from the street scape and public spaces to the spatial distribution of land uses and urban form. Team-taught by staff members of various backgrounds, interdisciplinary exchange is fostered. Introductory general readings expand to include surveys and experimental research as the course progresses. Original projects investigating quantifiable relationships and their impact on the planning process are required.

UPL 542 URBAN DESIGN SEMINAR-STUDIO (3), III

Explore new approaches to urban design. Relate physical form with theories of urban growth. Investigate multi-variant models of city-building consonant with alternative economic and political parameters. Develop advanced methods of form analysis to express physical relationships and social-psychological implications of urban design. Major emphasis will be on individual research in various design areas within a studio problem context.

UPL 543 URBAN FORM SEMINAR (3)

The theoretical basis for urban form. The analysis of historical and contemporary urban form. An introduction to urban design philosophy and the urban design process.

Regional Planning

UPL 550 REGIONAL PLANNING THEORY (3), I

Theories and models of spatial organization focused on regional development. Exploration of definitions, concepts and objectives and measures of regional development. Consideration of the roles and problems of resources and constraints in regional development.

UPL 551 REGIONAL LOCATION-SPATIAL THEORY (3), III

A course intended to acquaint students with regional planning theory dealing with the spatial distribution of activities. Topics include industrial location, land rent and land use, principles for rational location choice. Elaborates on factors that affect location. Design of advanced regional models, mathematical programming, intraregional allocation models.

UPL 557 REGIONAL PLANNING ETHICS AND TECHNIQUES (3), II

An advanced seminar in applied methods of regional analysis for planning. Elaborates on techniques used for regional delineation, comparative analysis, interdependency, growth models, programming. Regional accounts, factor analysis, interregional flows, cost-benefit analysis. Extensive coverage of recent and emerging studies.

Transportation Planning

UPL 560 TRANSPORTATION PLANNING (3), I, IV

Movement systems in urban and regional areas. Existing and experimental techniques for analysis and planning for transportation. Theoretical models in the planning process.

UPL 562 TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS ANALYSIS (3), II

An extensive examination of urban mass transit planning and operational experiences throughout North America in conjunction with limited discussion of Western European experience. Evaluation of federal demonstration grants in the area of mass transit planning. Critical examination of the application of systems technology to the area of urban transportation problems, with reference to existing gaps in technology and attempts to satisfy the transportation demand in such areas. Evaluation of alternate systems.

UPL 563 OPTIMIZING TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS (3), I

Transportation as a function system in the man-made systems space. Consideration given to transportation in cities, metropolitan regions, and large administrative areas. Outline of a theory for man-made systems space introduced. Optimality issues of transportation systems interpreted in the light of this theory. Economic theories on this subject are also discussed. Emphasizes the importance of theory in dealing with the optimality issues of urban systems, such as transportation.

UPL 564 SOCIAL-ECONOMIC IMPACT OF TRANSPORT INVESTMENT (3), II

Examination of effect of national transportation policy upon national development. Transport requirements for development. Choice of transport technology. Institutional arrangements for effective transportation development. Regional development policies and their relation to choice of transportation policy. Regional impact of accessibility. Analysis of factors which are preconditions for successful regional development with transportation investment.

Effect of transportation policy on urban form and urban development. Impact of the investment of the public sector upon private investment. Ecological considerations of transportation policy. Use of models of urban development as methods of determining and forecasting social-economic impact. Goal oriented planning-the use of transportation policy decisions for social economic goal attainment.

UPL 565 FEASIBILITY ANALYSIS IN TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM DESIGN (3), IV

Outline of methods of analysis for decisions under certainty. Cost/benefit and cost effectiveness analysis. Rate of return analysis. Decision-making under conditions of uncertainty. Treatment of intangibles; non-monetary and non-quantifiable factors. Goals Achievement Matrices applied to transportation plans. Rational Decision Making Techniques for transportation planning. Linear Programming methods and solutions. Case studies of transportation plan evaluation; Puget Sound, Atlanta, Chicago, Penn Jersey and Tri-State Transportation studies.

UPL 565 FEASIBILITY ANALYSIS IN TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM DESIGN (continued)

Transportation plan selection at the national level. Comparison of policy decision in highly industrialized nations and developing nations.

UPL 568 TRANSPORTATION PLANNING SEMINAR (3), II

Advanced consideration of transportation planning processes and problems. Examination of governmental programs and objectives, as well as technical, social, and economic aspects of transportation systems.

Health Planning

UPL 570 HEALTH PLANNING IMPLICATIONS OF OUR CHANGING CULTURE (3), I

The implications of social and cultural changes for various segments of the healing professions, and the concomittant implications for health planning will be considered in depth. An historical approach will be taken to build a foundation for understanding the complex interrelationships between the institutions involved in delivering health services to a population, and all other elements of the socio-cultural system. Trends in cultural change will be explored for their relevance to the skills and knowledge necessary for adequate health planning for the future.

UPL 571 COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH PLANNING (3), II

A study of the principles and practices of planning applied to the content area of comprehensive community health. Urban and regional theory related to health services, facilities, and manpower problems. The structure and organization of health planning activities at the urban, regional, state, and federal levels.

UPL 572 ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH PLANNING (3), II

A study of the principles of environmental health with detailed consideration of the means of analysis of environmental conditions and their effect on health and the measure available for control and maintenance of a healthful environment.

UPL 573 COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH PLANNING ADMINISTRATION (3), III

A seminar for health planning administrators which focuses on both the philosophy behind comprehensive planning and the evolution, organization and operation of public health agencies and health planning agencies.

Policy Planning and Inter-governmental Relations

UPL 580 PLANNING LEGISLATION SEMINAR (3), II

Advanced consideration of constraints set by legal concepts, e.g., due process, equal protection, police power; examination in depth of objectives, criteria, and methods of preparation of legislative acts and ordinances.

UPL 581 METROPOLITAN PLANNING (3), I

Provides familiarity with relationship among planning activities carried on at different levels of government. Comprehensive in scope but centers on methods of facilitating metropolitan planning. Course is divided into five major segments: (1) multijurisdictional aspects of planning; (2) regionalism; (3) current practices in metropolitan planning; (4) implementation of metropolitan planning; and (5) future developments in metropolitan planning.

UPL 582 STATE PLANNING PROCESS (3), II

Provides a background to the theory and practice of modern state central planning. Emphasis placed on tools and mechanisms utilized in the state planning process. Class discussions focus on philosophy of state planning, position and operation of function of central planning in relation to the executive and legislative branches of state government, policy formulation, coordination of central planning to line agency planning, means of implementation, and intergovernmental relationships.

UPL 583 ELEMENTS OF NATIONAL PLANNING (3), III

Provides a familiarity to past, present, and potential utilization of planning practices at the national level of government. Attention is focused on the rise and fall of national planning efforts of recent decades and the federal role in encouraging planning in state and local government, as well as the problems that this effort has precipitated among federal agencies. Recent planning and policy coordination efforts by federal agencies and the need for coordinated national planning and its probable effect on state and local planning activities is examined.

UPL 584 INTER-JURISDICTIONAL FISCAL PROBLEMS IN PLANNING IMPLEMENTATION (3)

Examination of the fiscal aspects of urban and regional planning problems and their relationship to rational determination of urban public policy. The emphasis is on identification of those aspects of metropolitan fiscal structure which frustrate the planning of urban areas and the solution of urban problems. Those aspects which are given greatest emphasis are: the distribution of revenue base within the metropolitan area, the inter-jurisdictional restrictions on revenue devices available to finance urban improvements, the distribution of cost-inducing land uses and populations and the effect of these on land use planning, and the effect of balkanization of governments and special districts on intra-metropolitan needs-resources imbalances.

UPL 585 PUBLIC FINANCIAL PLANNING (3)

This course examines the problems and techniques of public resource assembly and deployment in the urban community. Primary emphasis is on: the theoretical basis for public sector activity, the budget process as a non-market decision mechanism, current and capital budgeting processes, and evaluational techniques for rational budget decisions. The first portion of the course reviews the concepts of public needs and public goods as contrasted with private needs and goods. The second portion

UPL 585 PUBLIC FINANCIAL PLANNING (continued)

views governmental budget processes as a substitute for market decisions. The third portion identifies governmental budget processes for both current and capital expenditures. The last portion examines techniques for rational budget decisions such as program budgeting, cost effectiveness, and cost benefit analysis.

UPL 586 TECHNIQUES OF URBAN AND REGIONAL POLICY ANALYSIS (3)

This course will examine in depth the analytical techniques of the urban and regional planner as policy analyst. Its objective is twofold: to gain proficiency in the use of the techniques and to develop an evaluative framework with which to judge their appropriateness in various contexts of urban and regional planning. The theoretical assumptions of organizational rationality underlying the techniques will be examined, as will the question of inter-group and inter-personal utility measurement.

UPL 591 A,B,C,D,E,F DIRECTED INDIVIDUAL STUDY (3), I, II, III, IV

UPL 597r DIRECTED RESEARCH (3-9), I, II, III, IV

UPL 598r DIRECTED TEACHING (3-9), I, II, III, IV

UPL 599 THESIS (3-6), I, II, III, IV

UPL 800 COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATION (0), I, II, III, IV

NON-DEPARTMENTAL ELECTIVES: see Graduate Bulletin of the University.

I -- M. I. T., Department of Urban Studies and Planning. Departmental Course Listings:

11.
Urban Studies and Planning

INTEGRATIVE CONCEPTS AND AREAS OF SPECIALIZATION

INTRODUCTORY INTEGRATIVE CONCEPTS

11.01 ***The Planning Process***
(11.10) *(Revised: Unit change)*
Prereq.: ---
Year: G (1) 3-0-6
Evaluation of current developments in the field of urban studies and planning with special emphasis on housing, the planning process, and the uses of research. Areas of specialization in the Department and evolving views on the role of the planner are also examined. *L. Rodwin*

11.02 ***Perspectives on Urban Issues***
(11.105) *Prereq.:* 11.05, 11.07
Year: U (1) 3-0-6
Examination of the ways in which "urban problems" are dealt with and the ways in which society sets priorities for dealing with these problems. Analysis of various formulations of urban policy in relation to the machinery for policy-making and with regard to the content of various academic disciplines. The intent of the colloquium is to examine different ways of thinking about urban issues rather than to present a comprehensive body of knowledge. *(Restricted to Course XI juniors.)* *Staff*

11.03 ***Urban Problems in American Society: Responses and Strategies***
(11.585) *Prereq.:* 11.02
Year: U (2) 3-0-6
An examination of the implicit urban policy of the U. S. institutional structure — public and private, at the local, regional and national levels. Case studies focus on the evolution of federal urban programs dealing with some of the following areas: housing, urban renewal and development, poverty and community decay, crime, new communities and national urban growth, migration patterns, mass transportation and open space and recreational development. Discussions on topics such as the diffusion of particular perceptions of problems, decision-making in bureaucracies, evaluation and design of urban programs. *(Restricted to Course XI seniors.)* *Staff*

11.04 ***Models and the Metropolis***
(11.19) *Prereq.:* 18.01, 18.02
Year: U (1) 4-0-8
Discussion of the principles and characteristics of modeling in the social sciences and examination, in detail, of current attempts at reducing the metropolis to systematics. *A. Fleisher*

11.05 ***Urban Social Structure and Process***
(11.50) *(Revised: Unit change)*
Prereq.: ---
Year: U (2) 3-0-6
Examination of the city as a social system, including an analysis of the sources and implications of social stratification. Study of the conflict relations among various segments of the urban population — race, religion, and social class — and their implications. Examination of segregation and its effects. The physical and environmental characteristics of a city as outputs of social systems, as well as social constraints upon behavior are considered. *Staff*

11.06J ***Urban Problems and Policies*** **(A)**
(11.580J) (Same subject as 17.982J)
Prereq.: 11.01; 11.05 or 11.501
Year: G (2) *Arr.*
Analysis of political roots and social consequences of selected urban policies, ranging from law enforcement, welfare, and education to transportation, urban renewal and model cities. Study of numerous proposals for change. *B. J. Frieden, A. A. Altshuler*

11.07 ***Economic Issues in Urban Planning***
(11.60) *Prereq.:* 14.01, 14.02
Year: U (1) 3-0-6
Economic, social and technological factors which affect the functions and physical environment of the city. Analytical techniques for predicting the effect of alternative policies on the growth and structural change of metropolitan areas with respect to economic, spatial, and employment characteristics. Urban fiscal relationships. Economies of scale in providing urban services, demand for public services, sources of tax revenue, and distributional implications of alternative tax-expenditure policies. *J. R. Harris*

11.08 ***The Urban Transportation Problem*** **(A)**
(11.21) *(Revised: Unit change)*
Prereq.: 11.07, 11.11
Year: G (2) 2-0-7
Examination of transportation as a group of systems related to urban structure and particular urban and social problems. The planning of urban transportation as a professional activity characterized by several methodological approaches, and as a set of public issues.
R. Gakenheimer

11.09 ***Technology and the City***
(New)
Prereq.: ---
Year: U (2) 3-0-6
Seminar dealing with the impact of technology on the form and function of cities and urban regions. Focus on the "processes" of change especially institutional adaptation to technological innovation. Topics to be discussed include the design and implementation of new social institutions and service networks. *D. Schon*

11.11 ***Components of the Urban Environment***
(Revised: Unit change)
Prereq.: ---
Year: U (1) 4-0-8
Physical nature and characteristics of the urban environment and its component parts. Land uses for residences, commerce, industry, institutions, etc. Circulation elements; streets, expressways, transit, parking. Physical structure and relationship of parts of city and regional development. *(Enrollment restricted to juniors, seniors, and graduate students.)* *J. T. Howard*

HOUSING, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND URBAN ECONOMICS

11.20 ***Introduction to Housing Problems***
(11.24) *(Revised: Unit change)*
Prereq.: 11.05; 11.11 or 14.01
Year: U (1) 3-0-6
The meaning and scope of housing problems. Focus on the interdisciplinary nature of housing problems — their sociological, political, economic, and architectural components — as well as on the emergence of public policy in the housing area and the social and political context from which the elements of that policy have emerged.
L. C. Keyes

Descriptions

11.571 ***Urban Legal Issues***
(11.701) (*Revised: Unit change*)
Prereq.: 11.05, 11.07 or 11.11
Year: U (1) 2–0–7

11.572 ***Urban Legal Issues*** **(A)**
(11.702) (*Revised: Unit change*)
Prereq.: 11.501, 11.571
Year: G (2) 2–0–7

Seminars on the legal process and the application of legal solutions to the problems of urban society. Focus varies from term to term, ranging from legal assistance in the "war" against poverty to zoning, and the law of land use, urban renewal, and housing code enforcement. *Staff*

11.581 ***Institutional Change in Urban America***
(11.851) **(A)**
Prereq.: 11.05, 11.501; or 11.522
Year: G (1) *Arr.*

11.582 ***Seminar in Institutional Change in Urban***
(11.852) ***America*** **(A)**
Prereq.: 11.581
Year: G (2) *Arr.*

A seminar on institutional change in urban America from roughly 1890 to the present. Topics: centralization, professionalization, and bureaucratization of the police, schools, welfare, and other urban institutions. First term: readings and discussions. Second term: research seminar and preparation of papers. (*Limited enrollment. Permission of instructor required.*)
R. M. Fogelson, M. Rein

11.59 ***Seminar in Planning Theory*** **(A)**
(11.80) *Prereq.:* 11.01, 11.501
Year: G (2) *Arr.*

Current theories and research in planning, planning organization and action, and the relationship of physical planning to social planning and the general theory and process of planning. Required papers and extensive readings. (*Limited enrollment.*) *Staff*

PLANNING, ANALYTICAL AND RESEARCH METHODS

PLANNING METHODS

11.70 ***Representation***
(11.001) (*Revised: Unit change*)
Prereq.: —
Year: U (1) 1–3–5

Use of graphic techniques to record or control the environment and to express ideas: freehand drawing, elementary drafting, three-dimensional models, surveying and mapping, diagrams, graphic presentation. The common principles underlying these techniques and their use as tools in analysis. For entering planning students without background in design fields. *Staff*

11.711 ***Community and Regional Planning***
(11.01) ***Methods***
Prereq.: ——
Year: U (1, 2) *Arr.*

11.712 ***Community and Regional Planning***
(11.03) ***Methods*** **(A)**
Prereq.: 11.711
Year: G (1, 2) *Arr.*

Studies and practice in the methods and processes of community and regional planning. Examination of current methods of plan-making and decision-making, development of new tools, and their practical field application. Course combines seminar and field-work formats, with readings and discussion keyed to student involvement of the class in a real community planning program. *P. Herr*

11.72 ***City Planning Techniques***
(11.12) *Prereq.:* 11.11
Year: G (2) 3–0–6

Survey, analysis, and design methods and practices in comprehensive planning: population and economic development, land use, circulation, other components of the city or metropolitan general plan; relationship of planning to implementation techniques, zoning, urban renewal, etc. *J. T. Howard*

11.73 ***Site Planning***
(11.15) (*Revised: Unit change*)
Prereq.: ——
Year: U (1) 1–6–3

Arrangement of structures on the land: building grouping, land use and circulation planning, site engineering, landscaping. Lectures and brief exercises in design and field analysis. (*Limited enrollment.*) *T. Lee*

11.74 ***PPBS and Approaches to Data Management***
(*New*)
Prereq.: ——
Year: G (2) 3–0–6

Examination of Planning, Programming, Budgeting Systems (PPBS) as a strategy for the management and control of resource allocation. Approaches to data management and data management systems viewed with a particular emphasis on the importance of information in the goal setting and evaluation aspects of the planning process. The seminar includes lectures along with a review of various case studies illustrating the technical and institutional problems of implementing such systems at the federal, state, and local levels. Opportunities also provided for field work in the Boston metropolitan area for those students interested in gaining practical experience with the problems of implementing data management systems. *K. Colton*

ANALYTICAL AND RESEARCH METHODS

11.801 ***Urban Studies Laboratory I***
(11.505) *Prereq.:* ——
Year: U (2) 2–5–5

Program introducing undergraduates to the types of data and the methods of collecting and analyzing these data appropriate to the field of urban studies and planning. Students have access to computer systems which contain the results of a variety of data gathering activities and to facilities for statistical analysis and display. (*Primarily for second and third year students in Course* XI; *others by the permission of instructor.*) *R. A. Walter*

11.802 ***Urban Studies Laboratory II***
(*New*)
Prereq.: ——
Year: G (1) 2–2–5

Seminars and exercises introducing graduate students to the types of data and the methods of collecting and analyzing these data relevant to Urban Studies and Planning. No previous computer experience necessary. Original group research projects required. (*Primarily for entering graduate students in Course* XI; *others by permission of instructor.*) *R. A. Walter*

11.81 ***Information and Social Research***
(11.90) ***Methods*** **(A)**
(*Revised: Unit change*)
Prereq.: 11.501 or 11.802
Year: G (1) 3–0–6

Lectures and seminars dealing with various approaches to social research and the ways in which research may contribute to the formulation and evaluation of policy. Discussion of methodological issues pertaining to the use

11.451 ***Case Studies in National and Regional Planning***
(New)
Prereq.: ——
Year: G (1) 3-0-6
Discussion of current approaches and problems dealing with national and regional planning in developing countries. Weekly seminars led by Fellows in the Special Program in Urban and Regional Studies ((SPURS) and invited speakers. Independent study and preparation of presentations by individual students or teams of students. *(Permission of instructor required.)* *J. R. Harris*

11.452 ***Seminar in National and Regional Planning***
(New)
Prereq.: 11.451
Year: G (2) *Arr.*
Continuation of 11.451, but with greater emphasis on the preparation and critique of written reports. *(Permission of instructor required.)* *J. R. Harris*

SOCIAL POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL INSTITUTIONS

11.501 ***Social Policy***
(11.51) *(Revised: Unit change)*
Prereq.: ——
Year: G (1) 3-0-6
Examination of different conceptions of social policy with special attention to issues of distribution and redistribution. These issues examined in a number of different fields, such as: income transfers, medical care, social services, manpower training, education and housing. After reviewing each of these sectors, an attempt at an overall assessment of the relationship between social policy and income distribution based on empirical studies in the United States and selected advanced industrial societies in Western Europe. In addition to a review of issues of distribution, attention given to problems of citizen participation, coordination, evaluation and social change. The seminar concludes with an interpretation of the limits and the future of social policy. *M. Rein*

11.502 ***Social Service Systems*** **(A)**
(New)
Prereq.: 11.05, 11.501
Year: G (2) 2-0-7
Examination of the fragmented pattern of urban social services and the strategies to coordinate them. Traditionally, welfare, manpower training, education, medical care and housing all initiated service strategies in an effort to be more responsive to these problems. In addition, new forms of information, referral and advocacy emerged under the auspices of Community Action, Model Cities and other federal programs. These strategies critically examined. Examination of parallels with current European reforms and exploration of their implications for the development of policy in the United States. *M. Rein*

11.511 ***Urban Planning and Social Policy*** **(A)**
(11.55) *(Revised: Unit change)*
Prereq.: 11.01, 11.05 or 11.501
Year: G (1) 2-0-7
Approaches to complex urban problems involving both social institutions and the physical environment, drawing on methods of urban planning and social welfare planning. Exploration of strategies for dealing with problems of poverty, housing, social service delivery, health care, income maintenance. Review of recent experiences and consideration of alternative policies. *(Offered jointly with the Florence Heller Graduate School for Advanced Studies in Social Welfare, Brandeis University.)* *B. J. Frieden*

11.512 ***Seminar in Urban Social Policy*** **(A)**
(11.56) *Prereq.:* 11.01, 11.05 or 11.501
Year: G (2) 2-0-7
Advanced seminar in planning methods for elected areas of urban social policy; emphasis on program and policy design. Focus, varying from year to year, on current issues in such fields as health services, low income housing, and manpower training. *(Offered jointly with the Florence Heller Graduate School for Advanced Studies in Social Welfare, Brandeis University.)* *B. J. Frieden*

11.52 ***Deliberate Social Change in the Cities*** **(A)**
(11.591) *Prereq.:* 11.09 or 11.501
Year: G (1) *Arr.*
Studies of theories and strategies of social and institutional change in urban settings, case studies in the formation of community corporations, urban development corporations, the advocate planning role, the neighborhood health center as a means to social change, low-income housing. Examination of relationships between social and technological change. Work toward a theory of social change, taking account of the stance and role of the change-agent, the institutional forms involved, and the special areas of concern. *D. A. Schon*

11.53 ***Educational Policy and the Community*** **(A)**
(New)
Prereq.: 11.05, 11.501
Year: G (1) *Arr.*
The seminar examines some basic issues in educational policy and planning, especially as they have emerged in various national educational strategies, and analyzes a number of attempted or proposed strategies for altering the American educational system. *(Enrollment limited.)* *L. R. Peattie*

11.54 ***Health Planning*** **(A)**
(New)
Prereq.: 11.05, 11.501
Year: G (1) 3-0-6
Seminar dealing with problems of planning for the delivery of community, regional and national health services. Analysis of current programs and policies along with various political and economic strategies for enhancing the accessibility and efficiency of medical services and health care programs. *R. Holaster*

11.55 ***Planning and Poverty***
(11.57) *(Revised: Unit change)*
Prereq.: 11.05
Year: U (2) 2-0-7
Varying approaches in theory and in action to the problem of "the slums." Readings on the nature of slums and of descriptions of slum life; guest lectures by people dealing with slum problems in the world of action. A paper required based on some first-hand experience with a social program. *L. R. Peattie*

11.561J ***Urban American History***
(11.485J) (Same subject as 21.485J)
Prereq.: One first year Humanities sequence
Year: U (1) 3-0-6

11.562J ***Urban American History***
(11.484J) (Same subject as 21.465J)
Prereq.: 11.561J
Year: U (2) 3-0-6
A seminar on American urban history from roughly 1890 to present. Among the subjects to be considered the concept of the "great" community, the nature of the ethnic ghetto, the decentralization of the American metropolis, the disintegration of the political machine, the professionalization of the police, the bureaucratization of the school, the character of the black ghetto, and the demand for community control. The first term devoted to readings and discussion, research and writing. *(11.562J not offered 1971-72.)* *R. M. Fogelson*

Descriptions

11.31J ***Analysis of Urban Design*** **(A)**
(11.38J) *(Revised: Unit change)*
(Same subject as 4.23J)
Prereq.: 4.20, 11.30 or 11.31
Year: G (2) 3-0-6
Analysis of the processes and the products of urban design. Discussion of descriptions of environments and of transformations and tests of the descriptions. Examination of techniques, especially computer-based, which can be used to aid the designer. Development of criteria by which to evaluate the adequacy of computer languages to represent design ideas, accommodate design processes, and to aid the designer. An independent project required. *W. L. Porter*

11.351 ***Psychology of the Environment***
(11.34) *(Revised: Unit change)*
Prereq.: 9.70
Year: G (1) 2-0-7
Applications to environmental planning and design of methods and findings in psychology. Discussion of perception, attention, memory, thinking, inter-personal attitudes and behavior, needs and values. Use of experimental, observational, and survey methods in a series of exercises in environmental assessment. *M. C. Potter*

11.352 ***Research Seminar in Environmental***
(11.35) ***Psychology*** **(A)**
(Revised: Unit change)
Prereq.: 11.351
Year: G (2) *Arr.*
Advanced analysis of special topics in environmental psychology, emphasizing research methods for determination of the effects of particular environmental designs on the primary user. Development and execution of individual or group research projects. *M. C. Potter*

11.36 ***Problems in Urban Design*** **(A)**
(11.06) *Prereq.:* 11.30, 11.31, 11.711
Year: G (2) *Arr.*
Advanced problems in planning for the form of the environment at the scale of cities or regions. *T. Lee*

11.37J ***Collaborative Design*** **(A)**
(11.05) (Same subject as 4.162J)
Prereq.: 11.711
Year: G (1) *Arr.*
Project work on design problems which will benefit from collaboration between architects and city planners or between these groups and other disciplines.
W. L. Porter, J. R. Meyer, J. Beinart

11.33 ***Theory of City Form*** **(A)**
(11.81) *(Revised: Unit change)*
Prereq.: 11.07, 11.31, 11.30
Year: G (2) 2-0-7
Analysis of the functioning, effects, and implications of the general form of the urban physical environment. Effect of this form on basic human objectives. *(Limited enrollment. Not offered 1971-72.)*

11.391 ***Emerging Life-Styles and Their Habitats***
(11.371) *Prereq.:* — —
Year: G (1) *Arr.*
Sharing of first hand experiences in disarming character structures, free school education, communal living, cooperative enterprise, liberation of physical environments, and survival skills. *K. Linn*

11.392 ***Neighborhood Commons: Landscape***
(11.361) ***Architecture in the Service of Community***
Prereq.: — —
Year: G (2) *Arr.*
Field work in socially relevant common and open space development. Citizen participation in the planning and building of neighborhood meeting places, people's parks and playgrounds especially in the context of emerging life-styles. The class will also deal with the development of green spaces indoors, work in greenhouses and visits to the residential environments of the "green-thumbed" participants. *K. Linn*

DEVELOPING AREAS

11.40 ***Urban and Regional Growth Issues in***
(11.45) ***Developing Countries*** **(A)**
Prereq.: 11.07
Year: G (2) *Arr.*
Problems of cities and regions in developing countries in relation to national economic and social development policies. Extended readings and paper required.
L. Rodwin

11.41 ***Metropolitan Planning in Developing Countries***
(New)
Prereq.: ——
Year: G (1) 3-0-6
The nature of metropolitan urban structures in developing countries. Discussion of urban problems with an emphasis on analytical strategies, the development of planning methods, and the evaluation of programs.
R. Gakenheimer

11.421 ***Urban Settlements, Squatters, and***
(11.461) ***Social Change*** **(A)**
Prereq.: 11.05 or 11.07; 11.11 or 11.20
Year: G (1) *Arr.*
Lectures and seminars on the urban accommodations of the low-income sectors in urbanizing countries and the formation of squatter settlements. Examination of the principal social, economic, and physical determinants of housing and settlement forms and development procedures in the context of a transitional economy. *J. Turner*

11.422 ***Seminar in Urban Settlements,***
(11.462) ***Squatters, and Social Change*** **(A)**
Prereq.: 11.421
Year: G (2) *Arr.*
Seminar continuation of 11.421 for deeper examination of case studies. *(Permission of instructor required.)*
J. Turner

11.43 ***Social Aspects of Development*** **(A)**
(11.575) *(Revised: Unit change)*
Prereq.: 11.05 or 11.55; 11.21
Year: G (1) 2-0-7
Seminar discussion of the social and cultural aspects of economic development: urbanization, changing systems of social stratification, urban family structure, and the concept of a "culture of poverty." Treatment of the themes so as to show a sense of the social cultural transformations implied by economic development and how "social problems" may be thought about in terms of their technical, economic, and institutional parameters.
L. R. Peattie

11.41J ***Regional Economic Analysis*** **(A)**
(11.66J) (Same subject as 14.572J)
Prereq.: 14.03, 14.05, or 14.04, 14.06
Year: G (2) 3-0-6
Analysis of regional economies with emphasis on the sources, characteristics, and implications of spatial concentrations of economic activities. Urban development in its regional setting is examined and the special problems of lagging areas in both developing and developed countries explored in some detail. Methods of integrating national and regional planning investigated. The following analytical tools developed and applied: location theory, spatial competition, general equilibrium models of interregional activity with emphasis on input-output and linear programming models; models of regional income determination. Special attention paid to spatial factors affecting the demand for transportation services. *J. R. Harris*

11.21 (11.65) ***Real Estate Economics: Issues in Development***
(Revised: Unit change)
Prereq.: 11.07 or 11.20 or 14.01
Year: G (2) 3-0-6
Discussions of the various factors affecting the location, construction, financing, and marketing of real estate and buildings. Special emphasis placed on the relationship of public policy to the activities of the private sector. Case studies and guest lecturers. *D. Weisberg*

11.22 ***The Construction of Housing*** **(A)**
(New)
Prereq.: 11.20, 11.21
Year: G (1) 2-0-7
Analysis of the structure and operation of the residential construction industry. Topics include the industrial organization of residential building, the structure of housing markets, the role of housing in aggregate economic policy, the labor market, construction site management, and other aspects of the production process. *Q. Mills*

11.23 (11.25) ***Housing Analysis and Public Policy*** **(A)**
Prereq.: 11.20, 11.21
Year: G (2) *Arr.*
Seminar focusing on housing market studies and how they can and should be used by public agencies. Emphasis on the application of economic and political analysis to housing policies such as rent control, urban renewal, and homeownership for the poor. Housing policy issues viewed in the context of formulating objective criteria for establishing priorities and evaluating alternative housing strategies, including rent supplements, housing allowances, public housing, etc. *A. Solomon*

11.24 ***Planning for Community Facilities***
(New)
Prereq.: 11.11
Year: U (2) 3-0-6
Seminar dealing with the politics and problems of planning for community facilities at the city-wide and neighborhood levels. Discussion of such issues as site selection, financing, and strategies for decentralization. Analysis of relevant federal, state, and local programs and legislation. Illustrative material deals with the problems of planning for various facilities including fire stations, libraries, health centers, service agencies, and multi-service centers. *R. Hollister*

11.251 ***Issues and Strategies in Community Development***
(New)
Prereq.: —
Year: G (1) *Arr.*
Current issues in community development: tactics, experiences and alternative strategies. *(Primarily for those enrolled in the Community Fellows Program; others admitted by permission of the instructor.)* *M. King, F. Jones*

11.252 ***Seminar in Community Development***
(New)
Prereq.: 11.251
Year: G (2) *Arr.*
Continuation of 11.251. Discussion and analysis of case studies presented by Community Fellows. Emphasis on the preparation of written reports. *(Permission of instructor required.)* *F. Jones, M. King*

11.261J (11.67J) ***Urban Economic Analysis I*** **(A)**
(Same subject as 14.573J)
Prereq.: 14.05, 14.06; or 14.04, 14.06
Year: G (2) 3-0-6
Patterns and processes of growth and structural change within metropolitan areas. The land use market and the spatial structure of the metropolitan community. The housing market; demand and supply, growth, aging, and renewal. The urban transportation system and its problems. Models of the metropolis. In each of these topics, emphasis on the resource allocation process, its efficiency and implications for income distribution. *(11.44 would be desirable but is not required as a prerequisite.)* *J. Rothenberg*

11.262J (11.68J) ***Urban Economic Analysis II*** **(A)**
(Same subject as 14.574J)
Prereq.: 11.261J
Year: G (2) 3-0-6
Continuation of 11.261J (14.573J). The nature and problems of government decision-making in metropolitan areas. The economics of segregation, congestion, and pollution in the metropolitan area. Urban-suburban relations: market and government. Welfare economics and the normative theory of local public policy. Applied normative analysis: criteria for public expenditures; cost-benefit analysis. Examination of public policy issues in current urban problems: poverty, race, the spatial form of the city, optimal land use patterns growth and renewal, development and new communities. *J. Rothenberg*

CITY DESIGN AND SPATIAL POLICY

11.30 ***Introduction to City Design and Spatial Policy***
(New)
Prereq.: ——
Year: U (2) 3-0-6
An introduction to the design of the urban spatial environment: techniques for analyzing qualities of the environment, roles of the designer in the processes of urban development and change; historical evolution of approaches to city design; roles and values in design; the effect of public policy on the form and character of the spatial environment. *G. Hack*

11.31 ***Urban Landscape***
(Revised: Unit change)
Prereq.: ——
Year: G (1) 2-0-7
The city and its components as direct, personal, sensuous experience; view, movement, light, sound, climate, space, visible activity; identity, spatial and temporal images, meaning and development. Field observation and seminar discussions. *K. A. Lynch*

11.32 ***City Design*** **(A)**
(Revised: Unit change)
Prereq.: 11.30
Year: G (2) 2-0-7
Seminar on the principles and techniques of design of the large scale spatial environment. The relation between city form and objectives, the processes of design and management, the relation to the socio-economic context. *(Limited enrollment, primarily for students in urban design or city planning whose principle interest is in this area and who have had some experience in large-scale design.)* *K. A. Lynch*

11.33 ***Environmental Programming*** **(A)**
(Revised: Unit change)
Prereq.: 11.11, 11.30 or 11.31
Year: G (1) 2-0-7
Seminar on ways in which human purposes can be translated into explicit and testable requirements for large scale environments. Conceptual, human, social, managerial, technological and design factors influencing the translation process. Special emphasis on the sociological, psychological and esthetic functions of environments. Aspects of environmental programming for public facilities, service systems, and residential environments in highly urbanized and developing areas. *W. L. Porter*

of case studies, comparative research, and experiments. Problems connected with the introduction of research findings into the planning process also examined.

R. Weiss

11.82 *Survey Research Methods*
(11.905) *Prereq.:* 11.801 or 11.802
Year: U (2) *Arr.*

Interdisciplinary seminar with practical work and field experience, in conjunction with the Boston Survey Research Program of the M.I.T.-Harvard Joint Center for Urban Studies. Survey theory, methodology, and measurement and practice, for students seeking a thorough understanding of social survey research processes through intensive involvement in a major field undertaking. *M. Axelrod*

11.83 *Laboratory in Models of Urban Growth* (A)
(11.20) *(Revised: Unit change)*
Prereq.: 11.04
Year: G (2) 2–5–5

Deals with detailed studies of the design, workings, and results of selected simulation models of metropolitan change and their use in the evaluation of public policy. Term projects consist of investigations into some aspects of a model's design and/or behavior. *(Enrollment limited. Permission of instructor required.)* *A. Fleisher*

11.84 *Computer Systems Seminar* (A)
(11.912) *Prereq.:* 11.04, 11.83
Year: G (2) *Arr.*

Advanced discussion of existing computer systems and current research on new systems that help the planner to communicate with the machine. Discussion of the computer realization of mathematical models. Opportunity for the student to do individual research in the area of planner-machine communications.

W. M. McMains

11.851 *Computer Services*
(11.910) *(Revised: Unit change)*
Prereq.: ——
Year: U (1) *Arr.*

11.852 *Computer Services*
(11.911) *(Revised: Unit change)*
Prereq.: ——
Year: U (2) *Arr.*

Small group instruction in the basic principles of digital computers and programming languages. Practice in writing programs in algebraic and problem-oriented languages. Special tutorials arranged for students with no previous contact with computers. Seminars vary in length and suited to students' needs. *C. Lisby*

11.861 *Analysis of Urban Service Systems* (A)
(11.915J) (Same subject as 6.515J, 16.76J)
Prereq.: 1.07 or 6.28 or 6.579 or 18.303; 11.802 or 15.062 or 18.075
Year: G (2) *Arr.*

Lectures describe quantitative techniques useful in the analysis of large scale, urban service systems (e.g., fire and police departments, emergency ambulance services, airport mass transit systems) such as geometrical probability, multi-server queueing theory, spatial location, scheduling and sequencing techniques cost. Cost structures and utility theory and relevant methods of simulation. Discussion of problems with validation of models, and the estimation of parameters while emphasizing the development of models of system operations approaches to the evaluation of policy.

A. Fleisher, R. C. Larson, A. R. Odoni

SPECIAL SEMINARS AND PROGRAM OPTIONS

11.901 *Research Seminar: Topics in Urban Studies and Planning* (A)
(New)
Prereq.: 11.01
Year: G (1) 3–0–6

11.902 *Research Seminar: Topics in Urban Studies and Planning* (A)
(New)
Prereq.: 11.01
Year: G (2) 3–0–6

Topics for 1971–1972 include: urban growth strategies, the educative city, computer systems and computer-aided evaluation. *(Open to students by arrangement with staff members in charge of individual research projects.)* *Staff*

11.911 *Reading Seminar in Urban Studies and Planning* (A)
(11.92) *Prereq.:* 11.01
Year: G (1) *Arr.*

11.912 *Reading Seminar in Urban Studies and Planning* (A)
(11.92) *Prereq.:* 11.01
Year: G (2) *Arr.*

Reading and discussion of special topics in urban studies and planning. *(Open to graduate students by arrangement with individual members of the staff.)* *Staff*

11.915J *Analysis of Urban Service Systems* (A)
(Same subject as 6.515J and 16.76J)
Prereq.: 1.07 or 6.28 or 18.303
Year: G (2) *Arr.*

Quantitative techniques useful in the analysis of large scale, urban service systems (e.g., fire and police departments, emergency ambulance services, airports, mass transit systems). Unified study of geometrical probability, multi-server queueing theory, spatial location theory, scheduling and sequencing techniques and relevant methods of simulation. Validation of models and parameter estimation. Cost structures and utility theory. Applications: geometrical configuration of service areas; response time to high priority situations; stacking and delays at airports. Emphasis on development of policy-relevant models of system operation. Promising areas for future research are outlined.

R. C. Larson, A. Fleisher, A. R. Odoni

11.921 *Undergraduate Tutorial in Urban Studies*
(New)
Prereq.: ——
Year: U (1) 3–0–6

11.922 *Undergraduate Tutorial in Urban Studies*
(New)
Prereq.: ——
Year: U (2) 3–0–6

Reading and discussion of special topics in urban studies. *(Open to undergraduates by arrangement with individual members of the staff.)* *Staff*

11.93 *Preparation for Thesis* (A)
(11.95) *Prereq.:* ——
Year: G (1, 2) *Arr.*

Selection of thesis subject, definition of method of approach, and preparation of preliminary thesis outline. Independent study, supplemented by frequent individual conference with staff members. *(Restricted to doctoral candidates.)* *Staff*

Descriptions

EARTH AND PLANETARY SCIENCES

11.911 ***Special Studies in Urban Studies and*** **(11.961)** ***Planning*** **(A)**
Prereq.: ---
Year: G (1, 2) *Arr.*

11.912 ***Special Studies in Urban Studies and*** **(11.962)** ***Planning*** **(A)**
Prereq.: ---
Year: G (1, 2) *Arr.*

Small group study of advanced subjects under staff supervision. For graduate students wishing to pursue further study in advanced areas of urban studies and city and regional planning not covered in regular subjects of instruction. *Staff*

11.951 ***Special Topics in Urban Studies and*** **(11.971)** ***Planning***
Prereq.: ---
Year: U (1, 2) *Arr.*

11.952 ***Special Topics in Urban Studies and*** **(11.972)** ***Planning***
Prereq.: ---
Year: U (1, 2) *Arr.*

Small group study of special topics under staff supervision. For undergraduates wishing to pursue further study or field work in specialized areas of urban studies or city and regional planning not covered in regular subjects of instruction. *Staff*

11.961 ***Urban Field Work and Internships***
(New)
Prereq.: 11.711
Year: U (1, 2) *Arr.*

11.962 ***Urban Field Work and Internships*** **(A)**
(New)
Prereq.: 11.01, 11.711
Year: G (1, 2) *Arr.*

Practical application of city and regional planning techniques to towns, cities, and regions, including problems of replanning, redevelopment, and renewal of existing communities. Includes internships in municipal and state agencies and departments under staff supervision. *J. Gray*

12.

Earth and Planetary Sciences

UNDERGRADUATE SUBJECTS

12.00 ***Evolution of the Earth***
(New)
Prereq.: ---
Year: U (1) 2-0-4

Introduction to the concept and measurement of geologic time; evolution of the major features of the earth. Rock- and time-stratigraphy; biologic and radiometric chronometry; origin of the earth, oceans, and atmosphere; structure and evolution of continents and ocean basins; continental drift and lithosphere-plate motions; mountain-making. Closing discussion of the scale of perturbations generated by human activities. *R. S. Naylor*

12.001 ***Introductory Oceanography — The Sea Floor***
(New)
Prereq.: ---
Year: U (1) 2-0-4

An introductory course in sea floor oceanography reviewing the major features of the ocean bottom and how they are revealed by geophysical methods and deep drilling. *F. Press*

12.002 ***The Earth and the Planets***
Prereq.: ---
Year: U (2) 2-0-4

Selected topics in the physics and chemistry of the earth and solar system. Dynamics of orbits, properties of the atmosphere surface, and interior of the planets including the earth. Interplanetary medium, planetary magnetic fields, solar wind, and interactions. General lecture and a specialized recitation meeting each week. Recitation as workshop for in depth study in one of these areas: orbits, interiors, surfaces and atmospheres.
M. N. Toksöz, G. Simmons

12.01 ***Earth Surface Processes***
(New)
Prereq.: 8.01
Year: U (1) 2-2-2

Introduction to the geology of the near-surface parts of the earth. Development of landforms by moving water, wind, and ice; production, transportation, and deposition of sedimentary materials; sedimentary rocks; marine topography and sediments; description of folds and faults. Laboratory study of sedimentary processes and sedimentary rocks; basic geologic mapping techniques. Three weekend days of field work. *J. R. Southard*

12.02 ***Physics and Chemistry of Geological Materials***
(New)
Prereq.: 3.091, 8.02
Year: U (2) 3-4-5

Introduction to rock-forming minerals and their occurrence in the earth and other terrestrial planets. Distribution of major elements; application of phase diagrams to simple rock systems; Clapeyron's equation effects of fluid pressure; chemical differentiation in igneous, sedimentary, and metamorphic processes; applications of mineralogy to studies of Mars, the moon, and the interior of the earth. Laboratory emphasis on crystal structure related to the physical and chemical properties of minerals and identification of minerals which occur in common rocks. Two weekend days of field work. *R. G. Burns, T. R. McGetchin*

12.03 ***Structural Geology***
Prereq.: 12.02
Year: U (1) 3-4-5

Survey of rock structures and mechanics of rock deformation. Elementary concepts of plastic flow and fracture of materials with discussion of observed strains in all types of rocks in relation to mineral deposits, intrusion and metamorphism. Introduction to the geology of North America and survey of the important tectonic elements in other continental and oceanic areas. Laboratory work in map interpretation; five Saturdays of field work on mapping local structures. *W. F. Brace*

12.051 ***Crystallography***
Prereq.: ---
Year: U (1) 2-2-4

Introduction to the nature of crystalline matter. Patterns of atoms in crystals and how they are investigated. Crystal symmetry; point groups, crystal forms, space groups. Use of X-ray diffraction in the study of crystals. The rotating-crystal, Weissenberg, and precession methods. Modern methods of determining the arrangements of atoms in the cell, Fourier synthesis, the Patterson function, and refinement. Buerger, *Introduction to Crystal Geometry*; Buerger, *Contemporary Crystallography*.
M. J. Buerger

12.052 ***Theoretical Crystallography***
Prereq.: 12.051
Year: U (2) 2-0-4

Introduction to the theory of the structure of crystals, and application of crystal structure concepts to crystallog-

10.74 ***Radiative Transfer*** **(A)**
Prereq.: 10.301
Year: G (2) 3-0-6
Heat transmission in high-temperature operations and interaction of radiative and other transport mechanisms. Radiation geometry; matrix algebra in application to radiative transfer in enclosures; zoning method as alternative to integral equation, use of machine computation. Thermal radiating characteristics of surfaces, gases, and particle clouds. Radiation methods of temperature measurement. Synthesis of analytical and empirical approach to produce approximations of engineering utility. Quantitative design of several furnaces and high-temperature systems. *A. F. Savofim*

10.76 ***Oral Technical Presentation***
Prereq.: ——
Year: G (1) 2-0-4
Workshop using audio and visual aids to develop abilities to deliver lucid, succinct oral talks in a variety of simulated situations. Registration limited to 10 students. *B. C. Reid*

SCHOOL OF CHEMICAL ENGINEERING PRACTICE

10.82 ***School of Chemical Engineering Practice — Bound Brook Station*** **(A)**
Prereq.: ——
Year: G (1 or 2) 0-12-0
Conducted in the main plant of the Organic Chemicals Division of American Cyanamid Company at Bound Brook, New Jersey. Highly diversified operations, including process development and production of dyes, synthetic pharmaceuticals, organic pigments, rubber chemicals, intermediates, textile chemicals, plastics, resins, and related products. ——

10.83 ***School of Chemical Engineering Practice — Bound Brook Station*** **(A)**
Prereq.: 10.82
Year: G (1 or 2) 0-12-0
Continuation of 10.82. ——

10.84 ***School of Chemical Engineering Practice — Bound Brook Station*** **(A)**
Prereq.: 10.83
Year: G (1 or 2) 0-12-0
Continuation of 10.83. ——

10.85 ***School of Chemical Engineering Practice — Bound Brook Station*** **(A)**
Prereq.: 10.84
Year: G (1 or 2) 0-12-0
Continuation of 10.84. ——

10.86 ***School of Chemical Engineering Practice — Oak Ridge Station*** **(A)**
Prereq.: ——
Year: G (1 or 2) 0-12-0
Conducted at the Oak Ridge, Tennessee, Station located at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory of the Atomic Energy Commission, operated by Union Carbide Company, Nuclear Division. Work under direction of Institute faculty residing at Oak Ridge with emphasis on the application of engineering principles to the solution of research and development problems arising from the programs of the Oak Ridge National Laboratory. *(Application should be made three to four months in advance to allow ample time for routine entry procedures.)* ——

10.87 ***School of Chemical Engineering Practice — Oak Ridge Station*** **(A)**
Prereq.: 10.86
Year: G (1 or 2) 0-12-0
Continuation of 10.86. ——

10.88 ***School of Chemical Engineering Practice — Oak Ridge Station*** **(A)**
Prereq.: 10.87
Year: G (1 or 2) 0-12-0
Continuation of 10.87. ——

10.89 ***School of Chemical Engineering Practice — Oak Ridge Station*** **(A)**
Prereq.: 10.88
Year: G (1 or 2) 0-12-0
Continuation of 10.88. ——

GENERAL

10.90 ***Experimental Research Problem*** **(A)**
Prereq.: ——
Year: G (1, 2) *Arr.*
For special and graduate students who wish to carry out some minor investigation in a particular field. Subject and hours to fit individual requirements. *G. C. Williams*

10.91 ***Experimental Research Problem***
Prereq.: ——
Year: U (1, 2) *Arr.*
For undergraduate students who wish to carry out a special investigation in a particular field. Topic and hours to fit individual requirements. *H. P. Meissner*

10.92 ***Seminar on Technology Assessment***
Prereq.: ——
Year: G (1) 2-0-4
Examines methods for predicting the long-range impact of technological developments on society. Approaches will be explored whereby the broad social effects of exploiting or restricting a technological development can be considered and effectively expressed. Case studies in specific technological developments drawn from the field of chemical processing. Invited speakers from industry, government, and within M.I.T. will describe their experience in conducting and interpreting such studies. Emphasis on developing a methodology for technology assessment. Evaluation of techniques involving modeling, simulation, forecasting, morphological analysis, and modern decision theory, including use of the computer where appropriate. The role of the government in influencing technological change will be considered. *(Open to undergraduate students with permission of instructor.)* *L. B. Evans*

10.93 ***Teaching Experience in Chemical Engineering*** **(A)**
Prereq.: ——
Year: G (1, 2) 2-0-4
For qualified graduate students interested in teaching as a career. Tutorial or classroom teaching under the supervision of a faculty member. Students selected by interview. Total enrollment limited by availability of suitable teaching assignments. *G. C. Williams*

10.95 ***Special Problems in Chemical Engineering*** **(A)**
Prereq.: ——
Year: G (1, 2) *Arr.*
Directed research and study of special chemical engineering problems. *G. C. Williams*

10.96 ***Selected Topics in Chemical Engineering*** **(A)**
Prereq.: ——
Year: G (1, 2) *Arr.*
Topics of current interest, varying from year to year. *G. C. Williams*

10.991 ***Seminar in Chemical Engineering*** **(A)**
Prereq.: ——
Year: G (1) 2-0-4

10.992 ***Seminar in Chemical Engineering*** **(A)**
Prereq.: ——
Year: G (2) 2-0-4
For students working on doctoral theses. *E. R. Gilliland*

I -- C. Brandeis University, Florence Heller Graduate School for Advanced Studies in Social Welfare. Course Listing by Semester,

F I N A L

(THIS SUPERSEDES ALL PREVIOUS LISTS)

THE FLORENCE HELLER GRADUATE SCHOOL FOR ADVANCED STUDIES IN SOCIAL WELFARE

COURSE OFFERINGS

First Semester 1970-1971

COURSE NUMBER	COURSE TITLE	INSTRUCTOR
SW 202	Problems of Deviance	Scott
** SW 205	Introduction to SW Practice & Skills Lab.	Gurin & Perlman
** SW 206	Social Problems	Freeman & W.Jones
** SW 207	Governmental Human Welfare Programs	Dybwad
SW 209	Practica	Guberman, Perlman
SW 211	Community Analysis	Warren
SW 212	Formal Organizations and Social Organizations	Brown
SW 213	Social Psychology	Caro
** SW 216	Urban Public Policy	Fein
** SW 219	Humanistic Approaches to Problems in SW	Hoffman
** SW 220	Seminar on Social Theory	Kurtz
SW 231	Statistical Ideas in Research	Kurtz
SW 259	Structures and Processes of Administration	Mott
** SW 261	Principles of Economics	Rosenthal
** SW 262	Planning for Economic Growth & Development	Friedman
SW 274	Citizen Involvement in Social Policy & Plan.	Sieder
** SW 290	Seminar on Manpower	Derryck
** SW 293	International Aspects of Population Policy	Driver
SW 301	Seminar on Social Policy Analysis	Gil
SW 335	Quantative Analysis of Data	K. Jones
** SW 341	Theories and Tools of Policy Planning	Morris
SW 344	The Aging in Modern Society	Schulz
** SW 346	Seminar on Innovative Social Design	Austin
SW 349	Urban Planning and Social Policy (at M.I.T.)	Morris, Austin & B. Frieden (M.I.T.)
** SW 353	Seminar on Multivariate Analysis - I	K. Jones
** SW 361	Systems Technology Applied to Human Services	Eicker
SW 369	Tutorial, Dissertation Methods	W. Jones
SW 371-373	Tutorials	
SW 390	Social Organization of Medicine	Brown
SW 392	Seminar on Occupations	Caro & Miller

** NEW COURSE OFFERINGS

THE FLORENCE HELLER GRADUATE SCHOOL FOR ADVANCED STUDIES IN SOCIAL WELFARE

Tentative Course Offerings
Second Semester - 1971

COURSE NUMBER	COURSE TITLE	INSTRUCTOR
SW 204	Social Philosophies and Social Movements	Seligman
SW 208	The Relationship of Cultural Values to Institutional Behavior & Change	Spiegel & Papajohn
SW 210	Practica	Guberman-Perlman
SW 221	Seminar on Social Theory - Classical Theories	Kurtz
SW 230	Research Methods	Freeman
SW 242	Comprehensive State Planning for the Handicapped	Dybwad
SW 260	Issues and Problems of Administration	Mott
SW 264	Urban Economics	Hausman
SW 265	Role of the Public Sector	Schultz
SW 272	Historical Perspectives on Social Planning at the Local Level	Austin
SW 302	Seminar on Social Policy Analysis	Gil
SW 315	Theory, Design and Inference	Kurtz
SW 334	Social, Physiological and Psychological Processes in Adulthood and Old Age	
SW 336	Evaluative Research	Caro
SW 339	Field Methods in Research	Miller
SW 342	Theories and Tools of Policy Planning	Morris
SW 347	Comparative Social Planning	Gurin
SW 350	Urban Planning and Social Policy (at M.I.T.)	Morris, Austin & B. Frieden (M.I.T.)
SW 351	Community Mental Health	Scott
SW 352	Advanced Statistics	K. Jones
SW 354	Multivariate Analysis	K. Jones
SW 360	Seminar on Administrative Reform & Change	Sieder
SW 362	System Technology Applied to Human Services	Eicker
SW 365	Population Policy in the United States	Driver
SW 370	Tutorial, Dissertation Methods	W. Jones
SW 371-373	Tutorials	
SW 394	Methods of Social and Economic Research in Medical Care	Brown

I -- D. Harvard University, Kennedy School of Government, Program in Public Policy. Program and School Listings:

Courses for Degree Programs

The lecture courses and seminars listed below are offered by the School in cooperation with the Faculty of Arts and Sciences and other Faculties of the University. Other courses offered by the Faculties of Arts and Sciences, Business Administration, Law, Design, Education, and Public Health may well be of interest to particular students in the School. All courses offered by these Faculties are open to students in the Kennedy School; they are listed and described in their respective catalogues. In certain cases where equivalent instruction is not available at Harvard, students may attend courses at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, and the African Studies Center at Boston University.

PUBLIC POLICY

Public Policy 210. Analytical Methods

Associate Professor Richard J. Zeckhauser and Assistant Professor David Starrett

The uses and limitations of formal analysis in making complex decisions; abstraction and quantification in dealing with applied problems; the logic and practice of computer simulation of models; the role of the administrator in choosing a model, in supplying inputs, and in interpreting outputs; optimization concepts of mathematical programming; cost-benefit analysis; group decision models, theory of bargaining and negotiation; non-market, political games; coalition theory.

Note: Open only to candidates for higher degrees in Public Policy.

Full course. Hours to be arranged. 5069

Public Policy 212. Analysis for Decision-Making

Professor Howard Raiffa and others

Stresses the abstract formulation of real-world decision problems in business, medicine, law — especially problems which touch on issues

of public policy; does not stress the development of mathematical techniques of solution. Problems cover decisions under certainty and uncertainty, unitary decision making and decision by groups with overlapping as well as conflicting interests. Concepts (rather than techniques) are borrowed from mathematical programming, operations research, statistical decision theory, and game theory.

Note: Some knowledge of the calculus is desirable but not essential.

Half course (fall term). Hours to be arranged. 1815

Economics 219hf. Organizations, Decisions, and Welfare

Professor Kenneth J. Arrow and Associate Professor Richard Zeckhauser

For details see Economics listing.

Full course. M., 2–4. 5107 (VII, VIII)

Public Policy 220. Economic Theory

Professors Thomas C. Schelling and Francis M. Bator, and Associate Professor Henry D. Jacoby

The price system; how it works and fails, its accomplishments and shortcomings; institutional, political, legal, and ethical constraints on market behavior and market organization; the role of values. Situations where markets work badly, where there are no markets, where markets can be created, suppressed, or manipulated for policy purposes; policies that work through the market; policies that offset or avoid the market. Fiscal and monetary policy instruments to control the total and the gross composition of demand. Interaction of fiscal and monetary policy decisions with policy decisions affecting individual markets.

Note: Open only to candidates for higher degrees in Public Policy.

Full course. Hours to be arranged. 4934

Public Policy 222. Economics and Policy Analysis: Selected Problems

Professor Thomas C. Schelling and Associate Professor Henry D. Jacoby, and others

Intensive examination within an economic framework of four issues of public policy. Analysis done consecutively throughout the year.

Note: Open to candidates for higher degrees in Public Policy; others only with the permission of the instructors.

Full course. Hours to be arranged. 3225

Public Policy 223hf. Economics and Policy Analysis: Selected Problems

Professor Thomas C. Schelling and Associate Professor Henry D. Jacoby, and others

Intensive examination within an economic framework of any two of the four issues covered in Public Policy 222.

Note: Open to candidates for higher degrees in Public Policy; others only with the permission of the instructors.

Half course (throughout the year). Hours to be arranged. 3362

Public Policy 230. Statistical Methods

Professor Charles F. Mosteller and Assistant Professor William B. Fairley

The uses (and misuses) and handling of quantitative information pertaining to questions of social choice. Analysis of complex data; information storage and retrieval; sample survey techniques; art of asking questions; psychological scaling and scoring techniques; index numbers and social indices; clinical observations; analysis of heavily biased data; the design of "experiments" to serve program construction and control. Besides general statistical theory, students learn a basic computer programming language and have access to time-sharing consoles.

Note: Open only to candidates for higher degrees in Public Policy.

Full course. Hours to be arranged. 3569

Public Policy 240. Political Analysis

Professor Richard E. Neustadt, Associate Professor Graham T. Allison, and Assistant Professor John D. Steinbruner

A systematic framework for explaining and predicting and for trying to plan outcomes of governmental action; choosing aims; selecting tactics; assessing feasibility; and weighing risks in different policy sectors, foreign and domestic. The interplay of pressures and procedures in public decision-making: organizations, interests, positions, personalities, and values. The uses (and misuses) of history in analysis.

Note: Open only to candidates for higher degrees in Public Policy.

Full course. Hours to be arranged. 2822

Public Policy 247hf. Policy Outcomes: Analysis and Research

Professor Richard E. Neustadt, Associate Professor Graham T.

Allison, Assistant Professors Doris H. Kearns and John D. Steinbruner

Discussion of theories of rational action, organizational process, and political power as models for the exploration and prediction of public policy outcomes. Development of case studies to explain, predict, and prescribe policy outcomes, using various models of the policy process. Attention is paid to methodological problems in preparing case studies.

Prerequisite: Public Policy 240 or Government 238, or permission of the instructor.

Half course (throughout the year). Hours to be arranged. 5658

Public Policy 250. Workshop I

Dr. Richard E. Barringer, Mr. William M. Capron, and other members of the Public Policy faculty

Note: Open only to candidates for higher degrees in Public Policy.

Full course. Hours to be arranged. 3455

Public Policy 252. Workshop II

Members of the Public Policy faculty

Note: Open only to candidates for higher degrees in Public Policy.

Full course. Hours to be arranged. 2097

Public Policy 303. Reading and Research 7319

Individual work or work in small groups in preparation for the General Examination for the Ph.D., or by arrangement on special topics not included in course offerings otherwise available.

Public Policy 311. Direction of Doctoral Dissertations 8225

The Committee on Higher Degrees in Public Policy will designate members of the Faculty available to direct the research of candidates for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. In all cases the thesis topic must be approved by the Chairman of the Committee.

ECONOMICS

Economics 1310 (formerly Economics 168). Introduction to Quantitative Methods

Assistant Professor Edward Leamer

A systematic introduction to input-output and linear programming analysis, including a critical examination of several national and multiregional models. Some basic methods of economic measurements and projections used in economic planning are reviewed.

Prerequisite: Economics 10 (formerly Economics 1).

Half course (fall term). Tu., Th., 2–3:30. 7575 (XVI, XVII)

Economics 1400 (formerly Economics 128). Public Investment: Economics, Politics, and Systems Analysis

Assistant Professor Masahiko Aoki

Prerequisite: Economics 10 (formerly Economics 1).

Half course (spring term). Hours to be arranged. 2304

Economics 2060. Economics and Public Policy

Professor Dwight H. Perkins (fall term); Professor Francis M. Bator (spring term)

Full course. Tu., Th., (S.), at 11. 5845 (III)

[Economics 2100. Welfare Economics]

Professor Abram Bergson

Selected topics include the optimum and competitive equilibrium; consumers' surplus and indivisibility; second-best; externalities and public goods; social rate of discount; welfare and efficiency measurement; interpersonal comparisons and the concept of social welfare.

Note: To be given in 1971–72. *Prerequisite:* Economics 1030 (formerly Economics 199) or equivalent.

Half course (spring term). M., W., F., at 9. 6352 (II)

Economics 2180a. Decision Analysis

Professor Howard Raiffa

Foundations of decision analysis; structuring the anatomy of dynamic decision problems; assessments of interdependent judgmental probabilities; scaling of preferences for consequences when conflicting goals are present; decentralization of decisions; statistical reporting for pre-decision considerations; risk sharing; group decision making; bargaining and negotiation.

Half course (spring term). Tu., Th., (S.), at 11. 2047 (XIII)

[Economics 2180b. Decision Analysis]

Dr. ———

Note: To be given in 1971–72.

Half course (fall term). Hours to be arranged. 8035

Economics 2350. Economic Development of the Middle East and North Africa

Professor A. J. Meyer

Half course (fall term). Hours to be arranged. 1214

Economics 2380. Economic and Political Aspects of Imperialism

Assistant Professor Thomas Horst, Professors Albert Hirschman and Stephen Marglin, Associate Professor Joseph Nye, and Assistant Professors Peter Gourevitch, James Kurth, Arthur MacEwan, and Thomas Weisskopf

Analysis of various problems surrounding the investments of rich countries in poor. Primary topics to be considered are: the motivations and behavior of foreign investors, the interaction between investors and foreign policy of investor countries, and the impact of foreign investment on economic growth and socio-political trends in developing countries.

Half course (fall term). Th., 2–4. (XVI, XVII)

Economics 2440a. International Economic Relations

Professor Gottfried Haberler and Assistant Professors Thomas D. Willett and Thomas Horst

Half course (fall term). M., 2–4. 3775 (VII, VIII)

Economics 2440b. International Economic Relations

Professor Gottfried Haberler and Assistant Professor Thomas Horst

Half course (spring term). M., 2–4. 7798 (VII, VIII)

Economics 2480a. Research Seminar in Public Finance

Professors Martin S. Feldstein and Richard A. Musgrave

Deals with public expenditure evaluation, pricing policy, and other problems of public sector planning. Theoretical problems and applications to a variety of public policy activities.

Half course (fall term). W., 2–4. 8446 (VII)

Economics 2510a. Public Finance I

Professor Richard A. Musgrave

Theory and social wants, tax structure and effects of taxation, fiscal federalism and international tax coordination.

Half course (fall term). M., W., (F.), at 10. 1339 (III)

Economics 2510b. Public Finance II

Professor Martin S. Feldstein

Theory of public expenditures and expenditure criteria, models for planning and budgeting, econometric analysis of stabilization policies.

Half course (spring term). M., W., (F.), at 10. 6478 (III)

Economics 2540 (formerly Economics 148br). Planning and Program Budgeting

Professor Arthur Smithies

The application of systems analysis, cost effectiveness analysis, and program budgeting to public decision making. Is directly concerned with present efforts to apply those methods in the Federal Government.

Full course. M., 4–6. 6437 (IX)

Economics 2570hf. Economics of Environmental Quality

Professor Harold A. Thomas, Jr., and Associate Professors Henry D. Jacoby and Joseph J. Harrington

The economics of environmental quality and related topics. For advanced students interested in the economics of public expenditures, resources development, or environmental quality. Special emphasis is on problems of air and water pollution, solid waste disposal, noise and weather modification.

Note: Each student is expected to undertake a significant research project, preferably as part of his work on his doctoral dissertation, to present a prospectus during the fall semester, and to report on his findings during the spring semester.

Half course (throughout the year). Alternate Thursdays 4–6. 7315 (XVIII)

Economics 2590. Economics of Eastern Hemisphere Oil

Professor A. J. Meyer

Half course (spring term). Hours to be arranged. 3895

Economics 2640. Topics in Industrial Organization

Professor Richard E. Caves, Assistant Professor Marc J. Roberts, and Mr. William A. Capron

Emphasis is on problems of economic regulation.

Half course (spring term). W., 2–4. 5981 (VII, VIII)

Economics 2680b. Technology and Economic Development

Professor Albert O. Hirschman

The differential impact of different staple exports, transportation and public utility modes, and industrial activities on economic development and socio-political change. A working seminar.

Half course (spring term). Tu., 4–6. 2587 (XVIII)

Economics 2720a. Decision-Making for Economic Development I

Drs. Gustav Papanek, Richard D. Mallon, and Millard F. Long

Major decisions facing contemporary governments in less developed countries. Topics include: investment decisions, development strategy, foreign investment. Discussion is based on cases involving decisions actually facing governments in Asia and Latin America.

Half course (fall term). Th., 4–6:30. 1489 (XVIII)

Economics 2720b. Decision-Making for Economic Development II

Drs. Gustav Papanek, Richard D. Mallon, and Millard F. Long

Topics include: trade and balance of payments, fiscal policy, monetary and inflation problems, and government pricing.

Note: Students are strongly urged to register first in Economics 2720a.

Half course (spring term). Th., 4–6:30. 8722 (XVIII)

Economics 2730. Workshop in Quantitative Analysis of Underdeveloped Economies

Assistant Professor Lance Taylor and Marcelo Selowsky, and Members of the Project for Quantitative Research in Economic Development

Examines the obstacles to development, growth experience, and planning methods and experience in their use. Discussion of research studies by students and by faculty members of the Project for Quantitative Research in Economic Development.

Prerequisite: Economics 269 or consent of the instructor.

Full course. M., 4–6. 3079 (IX)

Economics 2760a. Elements of Transportation Economics and Planning

Assistant Professor Mahlon R. Straszheim

Principles of pricing, investment, and systems analysis applied to problems of urban transportation and its relationship to metropolitan development. Regulating policy and executive influence in all transport markets.

Half course (spring term). W., 4–6. 7158 (IX)

Economics 2800a. Urban and Regional Economics

Professor John F. Kain

Determinants of regional and metropolitan growth, theories of urban spatial structure, and the location of firms and households within urban areas.

Half course (fall term). M., 2–4. 3319 (VII, VIII)

Economics 2800b. Urban and Regional Economics

Professor John F. Kain

Uses the tools of urban and regional economics to analyze a number of urban problems including housing, transportation, poverty, and public finance.

Half course (spring term). M., 2–4. 8389 (VII, VIII)

Economics 2800c hf. Urban and Regional Economics

Professor John F. Kain and Assistant Professor Mahlon R. Straszheim

Working seminar open to those pursuing research in the areas of regional and urban economics.

Half course (throughout the year). W., 2–4. 5383 (VII, VIII)

[Economics 2810b. Manpower Policy]

Assistant Professor Peter B. Doeringer

Selected topics in the analysis of program and policy problems in the area of manpower and social welfare. Faculty and student research interest are combined with the experience of invited speakers from private industry, non-profit institutions, and government agencies concerned with manpower programs.

Note: To be given in 1971–72.

Half course (spring term). W., 4–6. 6289 (IX)

Economics 2840a. Collective Bargaining I (Offered jointly with the School of Education, the Law School, and the Business School).

Professor John T. Dunlop, Assistant Professors Joseph M. Cronin and Peter B. Doeringer, and Mr. William E. Simkin

This year will be devoted to the study of comparative industrial re-

lations and legal topics with special reference to the United States and Great Britain.

Half course (fall term). Th., 4–6. 8540 (XVIII)

Economics 2840b. Collective Bargaining II (Offered jointly with the School of Education, the Law School, and the Business School).

Professor John T. Dunlop, Assistant Professors Joseph M. Cronin and Peter B. Doeringer, and Mr. William E. Simkin

See description under Economics 2840a.

Half course (spring term). Th., 4–6. 8522 (XVIII)

[Economics 2910. Economics and the Arts]

Professor John Kenneth Galbraith

Meets for several hours weekly for a preliminary exploration of the economics of the arts including the performing arts, of the relation of the arts to industry, and the economic environment of the arts. Seminar guests include artists and individuals associated with underwriting of financing of the arts, with the performing arts, and with various branches of industrial design.

Note: To be given in 1971–72.

Half course (fall term). Tu., at 8:30 p. m., and other hours to be arranged.

Economics 2930a. Economics of Health Care Policy

Professor Rashi Fein

A survey of the basic economic issues of American health care policy. Topics include: the role of the market and government planning; health manpower; government insurance and finance programs; rising costs; the provision of urban medical service.

Half course (fall term). Tu., 2–4. 5935 (XVI, XVII)

Economics 2930b. Economic and Administrative Issues in Medical Care

Associate Professor Ralph E. Berry, Jr.

Organizational structure of the American health care system reviewed systematically. The institutional forms prevalent in the health care sector. Issues relevant to hospitals, manpower problems, medical education, and group practice. Alternative methods of financing medical care; such specific issues as the accessibility, cost, and quality of health care. Major problem areas, including health services for the

poor, health planning, and alternative methods of producing and delivering such services. In the later stages of the course there is an emphasis on health policies and policy-making.

Note: Offered jointly with the Graduate School of Public Health and the Medical School.

Half course (spring term). Th., 2–4. 2467 (XVI, XVII)

GOVERNMENT

Government 175a. International Organization and World Politics

Associate Professor Joseph S. Nye, Jr.

The experience of the League of Nations, the United Nations, special economic and social organizations, regional organizations (e.g., the Organization of American States, the European Common Market), and large international corporations from the point of view of their effects on the creation of a peaceful and just world order. Special attention devoted to the political effects of economic interdependence; the development of transnational society; the comparative influence of developed and less developed countries in organizations; and the impact of international organizations on national policies—particularly U.S. foreign policy.

Half course (spring term). Tu., Th., at 11. 4807 (XIII)

Government 201a. Contemporary Political Theory

Dr. Judith N. Shklar

Discussions based on extensive readings in 20th-century political theory. Emphasis is on the impact of changing ideological patterns and philosophical, religious, and psychological ideas upon political thought.

Half course (spring term). F., 2–4. 6025 (VII, VIII)

[Government 203a. Systematic Political Theory]

Professor Carl J. Friedrich

Lectures and discussions dealing with empirical political theory in systematic form, focusing upon the pathology of politics: corruption, secrecy, propaganda, treason, and violence.

Note: To be given in 1971–72.

Half course (fall term). W., 4–6. 5937 (IX)

Government 203b. Values in Political Science

Professors Carl J. Friedrich and ———

An exploration of the role of value judgments in political theory and philosophy.

Half course (fall term). W., 4–6. 2827 (IX)

[Government 207. American Political Thought]

Professor Louis Hartz

A comparative approach to issues in American political thought and development from the colonial era to the present, relating our experience to the history of other nations and cultures. Special attention is given to changing perspectives in American political and historical interpretation.

Note: To be given in 1971–72.

Half course (spring term). Th., 4–6. 3739 (XVIII)

Government 209. Political Development

Professor Samuel P. Huntington

Contemporary theories of political development and their relevance to modern societies and international relations as well as to the Third World. The seminar emphasizes the relation between national political development and the evolution of the international political order.

Half course (spring term). W., 2–4. 3166 (VII, VIII)

[Government 210. Topics in Comparative Political Development]

Professor Louis Hartz

The origin and development of states and nations throughout the range of historic experience, emphasizing political behavior and associated aspects of cultural and linguistic expression. Individual research papers plus group discussion based on a common set of readings.

Note: To be given in 1971–72.

Half course (spring term). Th., 4–6. 7279 (XVIII)

Government 212. Comparative Government — Political Parties

Professor Samuel H. Beer

Parties and pressure groups in selected Western democracies. Emphasis is on Britain, France, Germany, and on the United States. The principal question is how far the development of large-scale organizations has led to a convergence of styles and structures. Also relates these background factors to the contemporary resurgence of center-periphery conflicts.

Half course (spring term). F., 2–4. 5510 (VII, VIII)

[Government 215. Nationalism and National Development — Problems and Research]

Professor Karl W. Deutsch

The connection of the rise of nationalism with the broader social, political, and economic process of modernization in both Western and non-Western countries, using case studies and quantitative data and research methods from various behavioral sciences. A theoretical model for the process is developed and confronted with quantitative empirical indicators.

Note: To be given in 1971–72.

Half course (spring term). M., 4–6. 6271 (IX)

[Government 216. Topics in Soviet Government and Politics]

Professor Merle Fainsod

Topics in continuity and change during the Soviet period. Problems in research methodology, involving the evaluation of Soviet sources, are assigned for investigation.

Note: To be given in 1971–72. *Prerequisite:* A reading knowledge of Russian.

Half course (spring term). W., 4–6. 7066 (IX)

Government 217. Comparative Administration and Economic Development

Professor Merle Fainsod

A comparative examination of administrative problems encountered in organizing for economic development, particularly in South and Southeast Asia.

Half course (spring term). Th., 2–4. 6568 (XVI, XVII)

[Government 221. The Politics of Modernization]

Professor Seymour M. Lipset

A survey of social and political theory relevant to the comparative analysis of the politics of the "third world" nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Emphasis is on the social requisites of different political systems with empirical reference to these societies.

Note: To be given in 1971–72.

Half course (fall term). Th., 4–6. 4183 (XVIII)

[Government 222. Power and Legitimacy in African Politics]

Professor Martin L. Kilson, Jr.

Comparative analysis of formal and informal structures of power in

188

African states. Emphasis is on the legitimation of modern political structures.

Note: To be given in 1971–72.

Half course (spring term). M., 2–4. 3028 (VII, VIII)

[Government 226. Peasant Politics]

Associate Professor Roy M. Hofheinz, Jr.

Comparative analysis of the political role of peasants. Topics include the nature of traditional peasant society, the impact of modernization, rural-urban relations, and different forms of peasant mobilization. Cases are drawn from European, Asian, and Latin American materials.

Note: To be given in 1971–72.

Half course (fall term). M., 2–4. 3160 (VII, VIII)

[Government 227. Revolution and Politics in Vietnam]

Professor Samuel P. Huntington and Assistant Professor Samuel L. Popkin

Analysis of the political evolution of Vietnam in the 20th century. The roles of religion, regionalism, political parties, ideology, nationalism, and foreign intervention, in terms of general theories of political change.

Note: To be given in 1971–72.

Half course (fall term). W., 2–4. 5485 (VII, VIII)

Government 232 (formerly Government 225). American Political Parties and Voting Behavior

Professor H. Douglas Price

Readings and research on rise and decline of political parties in the United States. Seminar reports on current research on individual and aggregate voting patterns, state policy output, and patterns of legislative behavior.

Half course (spring term). W., 4–6. 8713 (IX)

Government 237. Collective Decision-Making

Assistant Professor John E. Jackson

Uses various hypotheses about group decision-making to develop analytical models of political behavior. These hypotheses range from the work of Downs, Davis-Hinich, etc., about the electoral process as a highly aggregated method of collective decision-making to the

hypotheses of Simon, March, Crecine, etc., about individuals, small groups, and bureaucracies. Students are then required to use these models to describe an observable set of decisions and collect data to test the validity of these hypotheses.

Half course (spring term). Th., 4–6. 6542 (XVIII)

Government 238. Cognitive Processes in Policy-making

Assistant Professor John D. Steinbruner

Theoretical focus is on basic problems of perception, cognitive structure, and information processing for purposes of making policy. Some topics in organization theory and some current trends in policy management. Specific applications to problems in American foreign and domestic policy.

Half course (fall term). M., 2–4. 5555 (VII, VIII)

Government 244. Political Change in the Urban Ghetto

Professor Martin L. Kilson, Jr.

Analysis of changing political patterns (e.g., organizations, recruitment, participation, political style) in the urban Negro community. Emphasis on the political sociology of Black militance.

Half course (spring term). M., 2–4. 1895 (VII, VIII)

Government 246. Research on Urban Problems

Professor Edward C. Banfield and Assistant Professor Martin A. Shefter

Empirical inquiries into selected theoretical and policy issues in the field of urban affairs.

Full course. Th., 4–6. 4590 (XVIII)

Government 247. State Government

Professor Samuel H. Beer

Main emphasis is on the forces making respectively for centralization and for decentralization in the federal system historically and at the present time. Critique of the roles of the states, especially in relation to urban problems. The inquiry is put in a theoretical framework to facilitate comparative analysis of intergovernmental relations in other countries.

Half course (fall term). F., 2–4. 2952 (VII, VIII)

[Government 250 (formerly Government 250b). Administrative Behavior]

Professor James Q. Wilson

The problem of rule-making and administrative discretion; the circumstances under which private conduct can or cannot be governed by appropriate rules; the determinants and consequences of discretionary behavior; and the relationship between rules, the sense of justice, and public policy.

Note: To be given in 1971–72.

Half course (spring term). W., 4–6. 2485 (IX)

Government 253. Policy and Administration

Professor Don K. Price

A general consideration of governmental problems encountered in the administration of public policy, with frequent reference to concrete experience. An analytical (rather than descriptive) approach extends beyond formal institutions and processes to the theories that support them. Extensive use of case materials.

Half course (fall term). M., 2–4. 6097 (XVI, XVII)

Government 255. Congressional Supervision of Public Policy and Administration

Professor Arthur Maass

The roles of Congress in both legislative and administrative processes; traditional and emergency techniques of supervision; the relations between congressional committees, their parent bodies, bureaus, and the Administration; history of congressional supervision.

Half course (fall term). Th., 2–4. 1585 (XVI, XVII)

Government 260. The Social Sciences and Public Policy

Professor Don K. Price

The special problems encountered by the social sciences in new relationships of science to public policy issues. Contemporary problems in financing and administering scientific research by government, universities, and quasi-public institutions.

Half course (spring term). M., 2–4. 4963 (XVI, XVII)

[Government 270. World Order and World Politics]

Professor Leo Gross (Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy).

New states and old law. Methods of promoting the progressive development of international law through the United Nations, the

specialized agencies, and particularly the International Law Commission in the context of contemporary international politics. Principles concerning friendly cooperation among states. The impact of law on the behavior of states and the impact of the behavior of states on law.

Note: To be given in 1971–72.

Half course (fall term). Th., 4–6. 5558 (XVIII)

[Government 275a. Approaches to the Study of International Organization]

Associate Professor Joseph S. Nye, Jr.

Problems of political and economic international organizations from the three perspectives of the international system, organizational growth, and national policy.

Note: To be given in 1971–72.

Half course (fall term). W., 4–6. 7411 (IX)

Government 275b. Problems of International Organization

Professor Leo Gross (Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy).

Problems and practice of peace-making and peace-keeping in the United Nations and regional organizations, particularly the Organization of American States. Case studies relating to the Middle East, Korea, Cuba, Congo, Santo Domingo, Vietnam, Cyprus, etc. The process of decolonization in and through the U.N. The place and potential role of the International Court of Justice in international relations.

Half course (spring term). Th., 4–6. 4528 (XVIII)

Government 276a. Problems of Supranational Integration

Associate Professor Joseph S. Nye, Jr.

Concepts and theories of political integration, examined with evidence from historical case studies and from current integration efforts in Western Europe, the North Atlantic area, and other regions among developing countries in Latin America, Asia, and Africa. Quantitative data and behavioral research methods are used to evaluate theories and models and to estimate characteristics of the integrative process.

Half course (spring term). Tu., 2–4. 3037 (XVI, XVII)

Government 277. Dynamics of European Integration

Professors Robert R. Bowie and Raymond Vernon

The internal and external economic and political factors affecting the

course of European integration; the present state of the process; and the internal and external consequences of alternative outcomes.
Half course (spring term). M., 4–6. 7445 (IX)

Government 282. Theories of International Relations
Assistant Professor Robert L. Jervis
General problems of theory-building in international relations. The levels-of-analysis question. Various theoretical orientations to the study of international politics, involving an examination of the subject matter through such approaches as psychology, decision-making, diplomatic history, quantitative analysis, and systems theories.
Half course (spring term). W., 2–4. 2446 (VII, VIII)

Government 284. Problems in Development Administration
Professor John D. Montgomery
Comparative studies of administrative approaches to improving the quality of life in developing societies, including American domestic poverty programs, foreign aid, and operations in the "third world." Special topics: comparative analysis of domestic and foreign aid programs; technology and political development; problems in the diffusion of technology for developmental purposes; "congruence" between Western and "non-Western" technologies; behavioral approaches to development administration; comparative problems in the rural and urban sectors of developing countries; project approaches and systems strategies in technical assistance.
Half course (fall term). F., 4–6. 5038 (IX)

Government 287. United States Foreign Policy under Changing Conditions
Professor Robert R. Bowie
How developing international conditions may affect the premises, concepts and objectives of U.S. policy and the U.S. role.
Half course (fall term). M., 2–4. 1678 (VII, VIII)

[Government 288a. Ideological Factors in International Politics]
Professor Adam B. Ulam
Soviet external policies and their relationship to Marxist ideology. The general problem of the role of ideology and of social and economic development of a given society on world politics.

Note: To be given in 1971–72.
Half course (fall term). Tu., 2–4. 7363 (XVI, XVII)

Government 288b. Studies in the History of Soviet Diplomacy and Foreign Policy
Professor Adam B. Ulam
Case studies of Soviet foreign policy and their relation to the international Communist movement, with special attention to the period since 1939.
Half course (fall term). Tu., 2–4. 5434 (XVI, XVII)

Government 289. Western European Studies
Professors Stanley Hoffmann and Laurence Wylie
An inter-disciplinary study of post-war Western Europe, with particular emphasis on the factors affecting the social structure, domestic and foreign policy, economy, and intellectual life, and comparisons with the United States and other industrial societies. With participation of visiting European faculty members and experts, as well as interested faculty members from relevant departments at Harvard and other American universities, the seminar concerns one range of problems affecting Western Europe during each term. In 1970–71 the topic is: Strategies of social change (fall term), including state control of the economy and policies of decentralization; and resistance to social change (spring term), including syndicalism and protest movements.
Note: Credit is allowed for either semester alone.
Full course. W., 2–4. 2672 (VII, VIII)

OTHER RELATED COURSES

National Defense in American Society
Professor Adam Yarmolinsky
The impact of the military establishment on American Society, and the processes by which defense policy is determined. Topics include: the structure of the establishment, nuclear strategy, arms control, choice of weapons systems, the budgetary process, military commitments and military resources, the locus of military influence, and the politics of defense.
Full course. Hours to be arranged.

191

History of Science 203r. Science and American Public Policy in Historical Perspective

Professor I Bernard Cohen

A graduate conference course: Qualified seniors may be admitted.

Note: To be omitted in 1971–72.

Half course (fall term). Hours to be arranged.

Natural Sciences 134. Technological Assessment

Professor Harvey Brooks

Problems of management and control of technology by government, with emphasis on the interaction of institutional political and technical considerations. Evaluation and assessment of specific technologies with respect to their environmental, social, and economic consequences. Graduate students in the Kennedy School who elect this course will be expected to do an additional research paper dealing with the assessment of a particular technological system.

Half course (spring term). Hours to be arranged. 2097

Resource Allocation Systems for Large Organizations. (Offered jointly with the Business School.)

Associate Professor Joseph Bower

The Seminar focuses on the processes by which major resource commitments are made in large organizations. Its goal is to develop an understanding of these processes as they have been described in recent research.

A concerted attempt is made to discover how the many approaches being taken to the problem relate. Some problems to which special attention is given are (1) the role of strategic planning in resource allocation; (2) the relationship between the planning of long-term resource commitments and the annual budgeting cycle; (3) the role in resource allocation played by various levels of organizational hierarchy; (4) the impact of performance measurement on the resource allocation process; (5) the differences in the resource allocation process between business and government; (6) the striking difference which stage of development and technology make in the process; and (7) the relationship between these problems and the body of normative theory.

A variety of conceptual frameworks are considered, as well as cases from several areas. A report is required of participating students.

Half course (fall term). W., 4–6. (Class begins Sept. 23, 1970.)

[Education X-222. Education, Law and Urban Politics] (Offered jointly with the School of Education.)

Professor ———

Note: To be given in 1971–72.

Half course (fall term). W., 4–6.

Federal Tax Aspects of Urban and Social Problems (Offered jointly with the Law School.)

Professor Stanley Surrey

A consideration of the effects of the Federal Tax system on urban and social problems and the appropriate contributions of that system to solutions of those problems. Attention will be given to the choice between tax and non-tax solutions to the problems discussed. Current problems will be examined and particular interests of the students will be considered in planning the topics covered. For example, topics covered in 1969–70 included tax incentives in general; tax aspects of housing and urban development; taxation and the poor, including income maintenance programs; Federal assistance to states and local governments, including revenue sharing; tax treatment of the aged. Mimeographed materials.

Half course (fall term). 2 hours a week. (Class begins Sept. 14, 1970.)

Federal Urban Legislation and Administration (Offered jointly with the Law School.)

Professors Charles Haar and John Kain

An interdisciplinary seminar, which will examine national urban policies, with particular emphasis on urban growth policy, pollution, urban renewal, model cities, metropolitan development, and new communities.

Half course (spring term). 2 hours a week. (Class begins Jan. 14, 1971.)

Market Versus Administrative Regulation (Offered jointly with the Law School.)

Mr. Leonard Ross

Over the last few decades, the "Chicago school" of political economists has constructed a powerful and comprehensive critique of welfare state administrative liberalism. This course will evaluate the Chicago position and examine, across a wide range of policy areas, the possibilities for substituting market for administrative controls.

We will attempt to construct and evaluate market devices for accomplishing policy objectives in the traditional regulated industries, other business sectors subject to heavy government control (the professions, the banking and securities industries), mixed market-public systems (health, education, the army) and problem areas such as pollution and accident control.

Half course (spring term). Hours to be arranged. (Class begins Jan. 14, 1971.)

Public Welfare Law (Offered jointly with the Law School.)

Professor Frank Sander

This course will seek to examine systematically the underlying premises and the present administration of our public welfare system. Among the topics to be considered are the nature of the right to public assistance, eligibility requirements, various sexual, family and work rules, determination of welfare budgets, and issues of privacy. Throughout, emphasis will be given to methods of challenge and change at the legislative, judicial, and administrative levels. The course will conclude with a consideration of alternative or supplementary systems of income maintenance, such as the family allowance and the negative income tax. Multilithed materials.

Half course (fall term). 3 hours a week. (Class begins Sept. 14, 1970.)

State and Local Taxation: Financing Urban Government (Offered jointly with the Law School.)

Professor Oliver Oldman

Property, sales, and income taxes will be analyzed in a search for solutions to current problems of government finance in urban areas. Also to be examined are user charges, revenue bonds, and questions of "vertical" and "horizontal" intergovernmental fiscal relations. A paper may be submitted in lieu of the examination. Materials to be announced.

Half course (fall term). 2 hours a week. (Class begins Sept. 14, 1970.)

Tax Reform in Developing Countries (Offered jointly with the Law School.)

Professor Oliver Oldman

Economic, administrative, and legal aspects of selected problems in land, sales, and income taxes will be considered. Materials will be drawn both from developed and developing countries with a view

toward policy formulation and design of tax techniques in the context of economic growth and social change in the developing countries. The foreign tax officials of the International Tax Program regularly participate in the seminar. Each student must submit a written report based on research or special projects. May be taken as a course or seminar. The Fall semester may be taken alone, in which case the paper is due by March 15; the Spring semester may not be taken alone.

Full course. 2 hours a week. (Class begins Sept. 14, 1970.)

Health Services Administration 12c,d. Policy and Practices in the Medical Care Organization (Offered jointly with the Medical School.)

Drs. Sidney Lee, Rashi Fein, and Alonzo Yerby

This is an interdisciplinary course emphasizing analysis, planning and decision-making in specific programs in medical care. The subjects covered include both governmental and voluntary programs; cost utilization, structure and quality of services; and organizational and manpower problems in medical care programs. Case materials and selected readings are used.

Half course (spring term). One two-hour session each week, third and fourth periods. Tu., 2:30–4

Illness and Public Policy (Offered jointly with the Medical School.)

Professors Robert Ebert, Osler L. Peterson, Myron Fiering, and Dr. Stanley Reiser

An interdisciplinary investigation of the institutions, social conditions, and values of American society having major effects on national health, and the formulation of alternative policy strategies to deal with the problems uncovered. The seminar will examine particularly the effects that social, educational, and economic deprivation have upon illness and medical care, the scientific and societal causes of environmental pollution and the policies and values which foster it, and the activities of the main governmental and private institutions concerned with national health problems.

Half course (fall term). W., 4–6.

Sociology 110. Urban Social Life

Professor Lee Rainwater

Explores theories of urbanism and empirical tests of these theories

represented by studies of a variety of patterns of social life in urban settings. Examines urban life style variations related to social class, race and ethnic, central city-suburban differences. Considers studies of informal social networks in cities based on special interests ranging from ordinary recreational activities to deviant behavior. Discussion of the implications for public policy of research on urban social life and patterns.

Half course (fall term). M., W., 10:30–12. 3509 (XII, XIII)

Sociology 223. Urban Field Studies

Professor Lee Rainwater

Presentation and critical discussion of research in urban social life. Students will be expected to complete a paper based on analysis of empirical data.

Half course (spring term). M., 3–5. 3221 (XV, XVI)

Sociology 230. Seminar on Sociological Aspects of Public Policy

Professor Lee Rainwater

Each year the seminar will deal with a particular topic at the intersection of sociological knowledge and a public policy issue. The topic for the particular semester will be announced shortly before the beginning of the semester.

Half course (spring term). Tu., 3–5. 4174 (XVII, XVIII)

Sociology 240. Research on Society and Politics in Latin America

Dr. Donald Warwick

Comparative analysis of data relating characteristics of the socio-cultural system and government in Latin America. Theoretical materials and readings are used but the primary emphasis will be upon work with empirical materials.

Half course (spring term). Hours to be arranged. 5858

[Sociology 259b (formerly Social Relations 259). Research Seminar on Family Behavior and Social Policy: Poverty, Affluence and Family Income]

Professor Lee Rainwater

Note: To be given in 1971–72.

Half course (spring term). W., 2–4. 8636 (VII, VIII)

Sociology 255 (formerly Social Relations 255). The Role of Intellectuals as Change Agents in the Western World

Professor Seymour Lipset

The change role of intellectuals in the Western World. Emphasis is on the relationship between action — (or managerial) — oriented intellectuals and value — (or moral) — oriented intellectuals and on the feasibility of cross cultural comparisons (France, U.K., and the U.S.).

Half course (spring term). Tu., 2–4. 4829 (XVI, XVII)

APPENDIX II: ILLUSTRATIVE PROGRAM SEQUENCES

A. University of North Carolina, Department of City and Regional Planning. Master's sequence.

B. University of Puerto Rico, Graduate School of Planning. Master's Sequence.

C. University of California, Berkeley, Department of City and Regional Planning. PhD. in Social Planning sequence.

D. Florida State University, Department of Urban and Regional Planning. Master's sequence.

II - A. University of North Carolina, Department of City and Regional Planning, Master's sequence.

PRIVILLGED COMMUNICATION

Courses currently required of all master's degree candidates include (in addition to statistics):

Pl. 106 Introduction to Planning and Urbanism (3)
Pl. 215 Theory of Planning I (3)
Pl. 231 Quantitative Methods for Planning (3)
Pl. 240 Planning Internship (Summer Field Assignment) (6)
Pl. 222 Planning Analysis and Design (Workshop) (3)
Pl. 223 Planning Problems (Workshop) (3). Options within this course are offered in Urban Simulation, Urban Analysis, Urban Design, Regional Planning, and will be offered in Social Policy Planning.

In addition, each option is developing its own requirements. While these are still under study, current thinking is that each option should have its own "methods" course and "law" course as follows:

Urban Planning Option
Methods - Pl. 235 Land Use Systems
Law - Pl. 230 Planning Law

Regional Planning Option
Methods - Pl. 232 Theory of Public Investment
Law - Pl. 233 Natural Resource Law and Policy

Social Policy Planning Option
Methods - Pl. ___ Social Policy Analysis (proposed)
Law - Pl. ___ Law and Social Policy (proposed)

The above requirements (27 credits) represent approximately half of the two-year program. The remaining half is open for electives.

Electives available within the department include the following:

Pl. 127 Transportation & Technologic Systems (Gakenheimer)
Pl. 160 Seminar in the History of Urban Development (Gakenheimer)
Pl. 176 Location & Space Economy (Knox)
Pl. 178 Regional Science Techniques (Knox)
Pl. 227 Urbanism Seminar (Chapin)
Pl. 228 Metropolitan Analysis and Development (Hemmens)
Pl. 234 Planning of Water Resource Systems (Hufschmidt, Moreau)
Pl. 237 Urban Spatial Structure (Hemmens)
Pl. 241 Environmental Planning (Hufschmidt)
Pl. 244 Urban Development Guidance Systems (Kaiser)
Pl. 246 Housing & Urban Renewal (Stegman)
Pl. 247 Issues in Housing Market Dynamics (Stegman)
Pl. 248 Transportation Planning Seminar (Gakenheimer)
Pl. 250 Urban Design Seminar (Cohn)
Pl. 251 Seminar on Design Methods & Techniques (Cohn)
Pl. 265 Social Policy Planning (Brooks)
Pl. 311 Independent Study

Pl. ___ Planning & The Ghetto (proposed)
Pl. ___ The Politics of Social Policy (proposed)
Pl. ___ Social Policy Planning Seminar - Field Work (proposed)

Electives available outside the Department taken most frequently by Planning students in recent years include:

Anthropology: Cultural Anthropology, Urban Anthropology

Economics: Macro and Micro Economic Theory, Public Finance, Economic Development

Geography: Urban Geography, Seminar in Industrial Location

Information Science: Fundamentals of Information Processing, Simulation Theory

Political Science: Public Administration, Urban Political Systems, Research Design, Intergovernmental Relations, Metropolitan Politics, Planning and Government

Public Health: Systems Analysis in Environmental Planning, Introduction to Epidemiology, Human Behavior

Social Work: Community Organization

Sociology: The Negro, Communications and Opinion, The City, Population, Social Statistics, Human Ecology, Social Change & Disorganization

Despite the uniqueness of the proposed curriculum, however, we strongly believe that social policy planning must be considered an integral part of the total urban planning function, rather than an activity separated from other, on-going urban, metropolitan, and regional planning processes. Hence the proposed social policy planning curriculum has been developed within the framework of the recently-revised curriculum of the Department of City and Regional Planning, rather than as a separate and distinct entity. This procedure--integrating the social policy planning curriculum with the ongoing course work within the Department--has the advantage of enabling those students who undertake a new option to derive maximum benefit from relevant courses already in existence, while at the same time opening course work in social policy planning to students specializing in other areas.

When fully implemented, the social policy planning curriculum will include, in addition to the social policy course sequence described in Appendix C, a series of four courses that are part of the Department's core curriculum. The four are:

Planning 106 - Introduction to Urbanism and Planning
Planning 215 - Theory of Planning
Planning 231 - Quantitative Methods
Planning 222 - Planning Analysis and Design.

These four courses, it should be noted, are considered to comprise the minimum body of problem orientations, theoretical perspectives, and analytical techniques which should be possessed by any person operating within the framework of the urban planning profession. They contribute significantly to the construction of a framework wherein the work of the social policy planner can be linked to that of the land use planner, the transportation planner, the urban designer and other specialists within the profession.

The eight courses to be required of all students electing the social policy planning option are:

Planning 265 - Introduction to Social Policy Planning
Planning 246 - Planning for Housing and Urban Renewal
Planning ___ - Social Policy Analysis
Planning ___ - Planning and The Ghetto
Planning ___ - The Politics of Social Policy
Planning ___ - Law and Social Policy
Planning 223 - Social Policy Planning Workshop
Planning 310 - Fieldwork Seminar

Brief descriptions of each of the above courses, along with outlines and proposed reading lists, are contained in Appendix C.

2. Field Work. As indicated earlier, during their two years of study, social policy planning students will be exposed to and involved in a wide variety of actual and simulated problem settings. Specifically, this involvement will take three forms. The first and most extensive involvement in community affairs will be accomplished through the internship program. The proposed internship program

II -- B. University of Puerto Rico, Graduate School of Planning.
Master's sequence.

VII. An Integrated Approach to the Teaching of Social Planning

As can be seen from the above description, there are some major changes in substance, techniques and workshop approaches to the proposed new program in social planning. These changes by themselves cannot claim to constitute a novel approach to the teaching of social planning. The novelty of this program cannot be adequately depicted by simply referring to a number of courses which seem to constitute the requirements to a master's degree in Social Planning. The quality and innovative potential of a social planning training program is decided by the supporting activities contemplated which in our case presents a unique combination of theory and practice, collaboration with public agencies teaching materials development and a built-in mechanism to evaluate periodically the training program and adjust it to the market and society demands.

1. Relationship with Government Agencies

One of the major areas for the social planner to exert influence conductive to social change is through organizations. In the case of Puerto Rico, there is the distinct advantage of a central Planning Board deeply concerned with ways of improving the present planning system and organization. The Social Planning Program is committed to collaborate with the Planning Board in elaborating methods of implementing a social planning system and reporting mechanism. The development of this system implies a redefinition of central and municipal planning functions.

TABLE 1

SOCIAL PLANNING PROGRAM

PRESENT COURSES AND TIME SCHEDULE 1968 - 69

Semesters	Courses	Credits	
First	1. Elements of Planning	4	
	2. The Planning Process	3	
	3. Techniques of Analysis I	4	
	4. Fundamentals of Urban Planning	3	
	5. Fundamentals of Economic Planning	3	
	TOTAL FIRST SEMESTER		17
Second	6. Fundamentals of Social Planning	3	
	7. Fundamentals of Regional & Resources Planning	3	
	8. Dynamics of Social Change	3	
	9. Techniques of Social Planning	3	
	10. Techniques of Analysis II	4	
	TOTAL SECOND SEMESTER		16
Internship			
Third	11. Social Planning Workshop	5	
	12. Planning of Social Services	4	
	13. Social Action	3	
	14. Two Electives	6	
	TOTAL THIRD SEMESTER		18
Fourth	15. Integrated Workshop	5	
	16. Four Electives*	12	
	TOTAL FOURTH SEMESTER		17
	Total Credits for the Master's Degree		68

* Electives include courses such as Social Disorganization (3); Educational Planning (3); Health Planning (3); Community Development (3); and other courses from other University Graduate Schools such as Public Health Program; Social Work School; Graduate School of Education; Graduate School of Public Administration.

4. Elective Courses. Although these courses serve many functions, the essential intent is to broaden the alternative fields available to students and to train him in depth for specialized planning jobs. The number of electives are partly based on an estimate of the supply of social planning positions available to graduates.

Most graduates will be working for public agencies. A market analysis made prior to the establishment of the Graduate Program in Planning indicated that there were 600 planning jobs in governmental agencies of which 300 were vacant at the time. Around 200 of them are closely and loosely related to social planning. Approximately, the analysis of the above mentioned jobs suggest certain distribution of sub-specialization courses for social planners.

30% Educational planners, including curriculum, guidance, and mass communications, teacher training, physical facilities, etc.

25% Socio-economic planners, including manpower, productivity, promotion labor mobility, working attitudes, etc.

20% Social services planners, including welfare, public order, community organization, recreation, advocacy of minority groups interests, etc.

II - C. University of California, Berkeley, Department of City and Regional Planning. PhD. in Social Planning sequence.

At the present time we see our instruction in this field developing as a sequence of five Quarter courses, followed by an advanced seminar, and supplemented by two summer Quarters of formal field work: The following courses, to be numbered in a "260 series," will be developed to serve the new program.

New Course Number	Course Title
260	Social Reform, Social Services, and the Social Professions
261	Social Change and Social Action
262	Analytic and Programming Techniques for Human Resources Planning
263	Behavioral Bases for Community Facilities Design
264	Political and Administrative Settings for Social Policies Planning
290	Advanced Seminar in Social Policies Planning
269	Field Work in Social Policies Planning

The following tentative outlines indicate our present thinking about the content of the individual courses.

Illustrative Program of Study:-

Because the third field will vary among students, and because it is not possible to anticipate the individual students' specialized and supplemental interests, a unitary course of study can be designated for all students. We expect that nearly all of them will wish to follow the two sequences offered by this Department, as described above. In addition, we can sketch possible study study programs of hypothetical students having certain specialized interests. Below, we outline the study program for a well-prepared person entering with an M.P.H degree, wishing to earn a doctorate in Social Policies Planning, and extending his Public Health studies in further depth by preparing his third Ph.D. field in Public Health Administration.

	Fall Quarter	Winter Quarter	Spring Quarter	Summer Quarter
First Year	CP 204* PH 206 CP 260	CP 203 PH 207 CP 261	CP 212 PH 202 CP 262	CP 269 (Field Work)
Second Year	CP 218 PH 295A CP 263	CP 250 CP 264	CP 247 PH 210 CP 290 (Soc. Pol.)	CP 269 (Field Work
Third Year	Reading CP 290 (Theory)	Qualifying Examinations PH 295A	Starts Dissertation	

*CP 204 - The Use of Urban Data
PH 202 - Advanced Theory in Health Administration
PH 206 - Ecological Theory and Health Organization
PH 207 - Advanced Medical Care Administration
PH 210 - Hospital Programs and Trends
PH 295A- Research in Public Health Administration
PH 295B- Research in Administrative Medicine

Such an expeditious program assumes that the student has previously completed sufficient work in Economics, Mathematics, and Statistics to perform adequately in the courses shown and then in his examinations. Those who do not bring adequate specialized backgrounds (very few of them do!) would of necessity have to spend more time than the 2.5 years shown. Students unsupported by stipends or scholarships and having to work would not be permitted to carry a full course-load, and they too would thus spend more time.

A great deal of variability marks any Ph.D. program, of course; for the students are encouraged to pursue their interests in different directions from those that have become normalized. It is especially important in a new field, such as Social Policies Planning, that the students' options for experimentation and exploration be protected. Freedom of inquiry and freedom to explore into new fields is a necessary condition for innovation and discovery. Thus, while we would encourage all students to follow a sequence of courses similar to those outlined above, we would simultaneously also encourage them to tap the large and varied intellectual resources of the Berkeley Campus.

The men we will be introducing into the Social Policies Planning field should become the intellectual leaders of the field within a very few years. We expect that it will be our students, quite as much as our faculty, that will be mapping out the future development of this field. For those who are capable of independent inquiry and of creative thought, we would seek to provide the core of knowledge upon which they can then build; but we must then also constrain their curiosities and interests as little as possible.

I -D. Florida State University, Department of Urban and Regional Planning, Master's sequence.

BASIC SCHEDULE
URBAN AND REGIONAL PLANNING

FIRST YEAR

TERM I	CREDITS	TERM II	CREDITS
Urban Spatial Structure I	3	Planning Legislation	3
History of Urban Form	3	Urban Spatial Structure II	3
Planning Methods I	3	Planning Methods II	6
Planning Theory I	3		12
	12		

TERM III	CREDITS	SUMMER TERM	CREDITS
Elective	3	Internship	
Elective	3		
Elective	3		
Elective	3		
Comprehensive Exam, Part I			
	12		

SECOND YEAR

TERM IV	CREDITS	TERM V	CREDITS
Planning Research Design	3	Specialization Elective	3
Specialization Elective	3	Specialization Elective	3
Specialization Elective	3	Specialization Elective	3
Specialization Elective	3	Specialization Elective	3
	12	Comprehensive Exam, Part II	
			12

TERM VI-A	CREDITS
Specialization Elective	3
Specialization Elective	3
Specialization Elective	3
Specialization Elective	3
Oral Examination	
	12

REFERENCES

Alonzo, W. "Beyond the Inter-disciplinary Approach to Planning", Center for Planning and Development. Research Working Paper, No. 90. November 1968. Institute of Urban and Regional Development, University of California, Berkeley. p.8.

Boulding, K. E. "The Boundaries of Social Policy", Social Work, Vol. 12, No. 1, January 1967. p.7.

Brooks, M. and Stegman, M. "Urban Social Policy, Race and the Education of Planners", Journal of the American Institute of Planners, XXXIV, No. 5, September 1968. pp.284-85.

Bunker, D. "A Doctoral Program in the Policy Sciences", Policy Sciences, Vol. 2, No. 1, March 1971. p.39.

Center for Studies of Metropolitan Problems, National Institute of Mental Health, "Fiscal Year 1972 Budget Statement". Draft.

Crecine, J. "University Centers for the Study of Public Policy", Policy Sciences, Vol. 2, No. 1, 1971. p.31.

Doebele, W. "Making Planning Education Relevant: A Proposal", Journal of American Institute of Planners, Vol. 36. No. 4, July 1970. p.269.

Donnison, D.V. "The Evolution of Social Administration", New Society, October 20, 1966. p.610.

Dror, Yehezkel "The Teaching of Policy Sciences", Social Science Information, IX, No. 2, April 1970. pp.102-113.

Dror, Yehezkel "Universities and the Teaching of Policy Sciences", Policy Sciences, Vol. 2, 1971. pp.83-84.

Florida State University, Department of Urban and Regional Planning, Application for Training Grant, #MH11193-01A1. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. National Institute of Mental Health, Center for Studies of Metropolitan Problems, 2/1/68. pp.2-50.
Additional quotes drawn from Florida State University Department of Urban and Regional Planning Program Catalog Tallahassee: Florida State University, 1970).

Gans, Herbert The Urban Villagers, Glencoe L.I., Free Press 1963.

Gans, Herbert "Proposal for a School of (National and Urban) Policies Planning at M.I.T.", Memo to Department of Urban Studies and Planning, M.I.T. unpublished.

Gergen, K. "Assessing the Leverage Points in the Process of Policy Formation", in R. Bauer and K. Gergen, The Study of Policy Formation New York: Free Press, 1968. pp.181-205

Jantsch, E. "Interdisciplinary University: A Systems Approach to Education and Innovation", Policy Sciences, Vol. 1 (1970), pp.410-411.

Journal of the American Institute of Planners, July 1970. p.232.

Kain, J. "Rampant Schizophrenia: The Case of City and Regional Planning" in Journal of the American Institute of Planners, Vol. 36, No. 4, July 1970. pp.222-23.

Kuhn, T. S. The Structure of Scientific Revolutions, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.

Morris, Peter Memo to Social Policies Planning Faculty, Berkeley, Undated. p.2.

Miller, S.M. and Riessman, F. Social Class and Social Policy, New York: Basic Books, 1968.

Obinani, F. "Planning Education in the Environment of Poverty: Training Resident Planners in Bedford-Stuyvesant", Journal of the American Institute of Planners, Vol. 36, No. 4, July 1970. p.261.

Piven, F. F. "Comprehensive Social Planning: Curriculum Reform or Professional Imperialism?" Journal of the American Institute of Planners, Vol. 36, No. 4, July 1970. p.223.

Rein, Martin Social Policy: Issues in Choice and Change, New York: Random House, 1970. Chapter I.

Reiner, Janet S. "Social Aspects of Housing and Urban Development and Social Policy" for Center for Housing, Building, and Planning, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, United Nations, New York: August 1970. p.1.

S. Rose, Community Action Programs: The Relationship Between Initial Conception of the Poverty Problem, Derived Intervention Strategy, and Program Implementation, cited in R. Warren, "The Sociology of Knowledge and the Problems of the Inner Cities," (unpublished manuscript, Florence

Heller Graduate School for Advanced Studies in Social Welfare, Brandeis University, Waltham, Massachusetts). p.10.

Titmuss, R. Commitment to Welfare, London: George Allen and Unwin, 1968.

University of California at Berkeley, Department of City and Regional Planning, Application for Training Grant #MH10823-01. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. National Institute of Mental Health, Center for Studies of Metropolitan Problems. 8/1/66.

University of North Carolina, Department of City and Regional Planning, Application for Training Grant, #MH11832-01. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. National Institute of Mental Health, Center for Studies of Metropolitan Problems. 6/10/68. p.2.

University of Puerto Rico Department of Planning Application for Training Grant, #MH12154-01A1. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, National Institute of Mental Health, Center for Studies of Metropolitan Problems, 8/27/69. pp.16-40.

Valentine, Charles. Culture and Poverty Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968.

Valentine, Charles. "Social Policy: Promise and Performance," in Letters from Readers, Social Policy, Vol. 1, No. 3, Sept-Oct 1970. p.50.

Van der Berg, P. L. Race and Racism New York: John Wiley, 1967.

"Vista and its Volunteers" New York Times New York, May 24, 1971. p.1.

Warren, Roland L. "The Model Cities Program-An Assessment" in The Social Welfare Forum National Conference on Social Welfare by Columbia University Press, N. Y. 1971. pp.140-158.

Webber, Mel. "Comprehensive Planning and Social Responsibility," Journal of the American Institute of Planners Vol.XXXIX, Nov. 1963. pp.232-41.